HG+

Archive and Reference

CONTENTS

Early Hyperology

Hyperology I

Hyperological Objects Above ∀− *and Below* $\mathfrak{M}_{\dagger 1}$

“New HG”

Informal Introduction to Basic Hyperology 1

Goodelian Hyperology

Hyperology and *Milestones*

Hyperological Objects Below $\mathfrak{M}_{\dagger 1}$

SuperHyperology^{+}

SuperHyperology

*Non-**MBC**ing Schizo List*

MRL 🍇 M THO mmm 🐑 yep yep yep !!" yippee ilove grapes 📜 📜

PART 1

now absolute infinity is supposed to be a set originally i think but we just make it a proper class and paradox destroyed
so basically, absolute infinity = ord (which kinda = V but V is more of a system that a container)
now what if we consider "collections" of proper classes?
ok so let's call sets 0-classes
and call proper classes 1-classes
proper classes (1-classes) are collections of sets (0-classes)
"collections" here means contains all of them, not just some
sets can contain other sets
but proper classes contain all sets
now we had to make a modification to allow for 1-classes right
we couldn't just use 0-classes to be collections of all 0-classes
we had to use a modification to make it work
now, let's apply this modification again to 1-classes to get stuff that can contain all 1-classes
these are called 2-classes
firstly i should explain how 1-classes work in more detail
they're just anything too big to be a set
another example is "the 1-class of all ordinals"
all ordinals are sets but not all sets are ordinals
there are actually absolutely infinite amount of 1-classes, in the same way there are absolutely infinite amount of 0-classes
we reuse our modification to get 2-classes
2-classes contain all 1-classes
we reuse it again to get 3-classes which contain all 2-classes
and so on
so we've got higher and higher orders of sets
now, time to bring out the numbers
usually numbers are sets, so we have to extend what a number is until it just encompasses size in general, this has a specific definition but we're not ready to get to it yet, just know that this notion of "numbers" extends as far and as high as we want
so we can use this to make "numbers" past absolute infinity
limit of 0-classes (sets) = Ω (absolute infinity, is a 1-class)
limit of 1-classes (proper classes) = Ω1 (is a 2-class)
limit of 2-classes = Ω2 (is a 3-class)
limit of 3-classes = Ω3 (is a 4-class)
the study of numbers past absolute infinity is called HG (hypergoogology), i am one of the founders, it is very very new (last year or so), quite small rn, but has huge potential in the future and is already extremely interesting, this stuff is the absolute beginning of HG, but it's cool because it's farrrr more philosophical than mathematical (these lower levels are more mathematical but just wait), you will see this later on. the further you go in it, the more mindbending, thought provoking, and batshit crazy things get.
0-classes, these are sets, they are collections of any kind of object, limit Ω
1-classes, these are proper classes, they are so large that they cannot even be 0-classes, limit Ω1
2-classes, these are proper classes, they are so large that they cannot even be 1-classes, limit Ω2
3-classes, these are proper classes, they are so large that they cannot even be 2-classes, limit Ω3
[cycle continues]

then we can get even higher extensions, Ωw, Ωinacessible, ΩΩ, ΩΩ1, ΩΩ2, ΩΩΩ... and so on

now, here's the thing, if you think about it, Ω1 is actually equal to Ω*2, but before we set up the notion of n-classes, Ω*2 would make no sense since we only had access to sets, Ω2 is actually equal to Ω*3, and so on.
limit of transfinites = Ω, but then we add a whole hierarchy of transfinites past Ω and our limit is Ω1 (which is nice enough to be equal to Ω*2), then we do the same again and again and again
ok so even though Ω1, Ω2, Ω3 was an effective way of getting higher and higher, Ω*n can actually grow at the same rate
usually Ω*n would be invalid, but when we add our system of higher -classes we are allowed to do it
so what about if we do Ω to the power of 2? Ω to the power of Ω? Ω to the power of Ω to the power of Ω?
imagine all the ways we can use Ω, even using very strong functions on it like up arrows if you know what they are
now
Ω(1) is a limit of all that (Ω(1) is not Ω1, they are different)
so Ω(1) is higher than everything you can make with Ω
the hierarchy goes like this so far:
Ω
Ω1 = Ω*2
Ω2 = Ω*3
Ω^2
Ω^3
Ω^Ω
Ω^Ω^Ω
Ω^^Ω
Ω^^^Ω
w_Ω
I_Ω
M_Ω
.
.
Ω(1)
(w_Ω is the next w after Ω, I_Ω is the next inacessible cardinal after Ω, M_Ω is the next mahlo cardinal after Ω, these are all far stronger than doing Ω^^...^^Ω, obviously we are extending these concepts past sets and into all n-classes)
if we can "use" Ω and create larger and larger stuff with it, the limit of that is Ω(1)
what if we can use Ω(1)?
and do things like stacking Ω(1), doing Ω(1)*2, doing mahlo versions of Ω(1) and so on
the limit of that is Ω(2)
we can continue on with Ω(3), Ω(4), Ω(5)
and so on

so you know how to get 1-classes, we had to have a change in methods but after that we could use "replacement" and do the same thing we did to 1-classes to get to 2-classes
and then we used the same method to get to 3-classes
all we had to do was use our term "collection"
but, let's extend that term
let's start with 0-collection
a 0-collection is just a set containing some other sets

so like the 0-collection of {2} {3,4} and {4,21} is {{2}, {3,4}, {4,21}}
but in order to "reach" CAI we have to create a new kind of collection
since the 0-collection of all sets would be a paradox
(remember that?)
we will call that a 1-collection
so 1-collections are wayyy more powerful since we can do that for any -class, they already have the paradox fix built in
so we can use a 1-collection of all 1-classes to get 2-classes, a 1-collection of 2-classes to get 3-classes, and so on
so our 1-collection tool is powerful since it has that little paradox fixing modification which alows us to extend very very high even into stuff like Ω(Ω(...Ω(Ω)...))
so a 1-collection is a modification of the properties of 0-collections, but it stays as close to it as possible
so we changed the bare minimum in order to let us get higher n-classes
we couldn't use 0-collections so we had to make the smallest possible adjustment to let us reach higher than the limit of what 0-collections could reach
ω†1 is so big that it is completely unreachable from 1-collections, think about how unimaginably powerful 1-collections really are, we can reach insanely high with them, we can make things like Ω(Ω(...Ω(Ω)...)) with them, but ω†1 is so huge that the amount of things it represents is too strong to even be a 1-collection, it's properties transcend the 1-collection concept of size itself and we have to use 2-collections to generate an even stronger version of "size" to even let it exist.

ω†1 is to 1-collections as Ω is to 0-collections, and the conceptual gap between ω†1 and Ω is the same as the conceptual gap between Ω and 0, to reach ω†1 we need a whole new system of what size even means.

here's a list of the hierarchy so far:
0, 1, 2... ω, ω_1, ω_2... inacessible, mahlo... Ω, Ω1, Ω2... Ω(1), Ω(2)... Ω(Ω).....ω†1
so basically we get sets which represent size nicely, however Ω is so big that it can't even be classified under that form of size, so we have to create a new form of size that's stronger, then using this we can find the sizes of higher and higher things, but then we reach ω†1 which again can't even be classified as that kind of size capable of describing Ω so we need to create a whole new concept of size again
also instead of copy and pasting ω†1, you can say wdag1
ω†1 literally needs us to modify the concept of size itself
same thing happens with when we start with transfinite stuff
ω†1 is like doing transfinite things all over again
which is why it has a ω in it
attempting to have ω†1 described as a 1-collection would create a paradox just like how describing Ω as a 0-collection creates a paradox
you know how when we just had finite numbers
to even get the concept of transfinites we had to restructure the whole idea of what size is, it's like a whole conceptual level higher
same happens at ω†1

PART 2

REFRESHER:
so we left off at wdag1
yes, it's the first instance where we have to modify our properties of size to get to it
n-classes are easy

0-classes are sets
1-classes are proper classes
2-classes are too big to be 1-classes
and so on
n-collections are the methods we use
so we started at 0-collections
but 1-classes are too big to be able to be reached by taking 0-collections
so we have to find a stronger method
which we call 1-collections
then if 1-collections were strong enough to bypass the "too large to be __" thing, we can use those to get 2-classes, 3-classes, ect
wdag1 can't be reached with 1-collection
we have to modify what a collection of things even is again to get to it, and we use 2-collection
START:
i'll call wdag1 a (1,0)-class
(1,0)-classes have to be made with 2-collections
now, since we now have our 2-collection method which is powerful enough on (1,0)-classes, we can use it again and get a 2-collection of all (1,0)-classes and we get a (1,1)-class
the difference between (1,1)-classes and (1,0)-classes is the difference between (1,0)-classes and 1-classes
we can make (1,2)-classes by taking a 2-collection of (1,1)-classes
we can continue on further
(1,3)-classes
(1,4)-classes
and so on
now
what about if we get something so big it can't even be reached from our 2-collections
we have to degenerate the properties of a number even further
this is wdag2, it needs a 3-collection to make it, and it's a (2,0)-class
we can then get wdag3 which needs 4-collections to make it, and so on
each wdag_ is far far far larger than the last
so basically what we're doing is with each wdag_, we're modifying the concept of a number just a little bit further away from sets/ordinals each time
and doing that alows us to go far further
now, there is a few things past this, but they are more technical, so i'm going to jump a huge leap forward
now, let's consider the ultimate generalisation of numbers
this includes all degenerations of ordinal properties, and more
it's just the generalisation of size in general
we will call this just "numbers"
i think i touched on this a bit before
yunno how we can extend +1, like have it work on 1-classes, have it work on (1,0)-classes, and so on, when normally it only works on sets
well, now let's extend that to all numbers too
+1 extends to all numbers so far without fail
we can do wdag1+1 and find the next thing bigger
we can even use +1 on wdagwdag...wdag1 and find the next thing bigger
E_0 is the first point where finding the next number after it doesn't work anymore, E_0 = E_0+1, it's larger than itself, it's self transcendent, it's a weird fractal of size
E_0 is the first point where we broke down numbers so far that they now break classical logic, so we have to then construct a new logical system capable of making E_0 work. E_0 is so large that it breaks the

fundamental rules of the usual logic throughout mathematics, it is larger than its own self, i will explain this logical system that we have to use from now on in more depth.
you can think of a huge numberline, like one of those matchstick diagrams they use to show ordinals, now try to imagine E_0 on it.. try to visualise what that would even look like, it would look like some strange fucked fractal mess, it breaks the concept of how order has worked so far in general
next time i will explain this strange multilayered logic system that we have to use after E_0

PART 3

now, E_0 raises a paradox
a fight between 2 conflicting things
it's like an unstoppable force vs immovable object type deal
see, the +1 is trying to make something bigger than E_0, and E_0 is trying to stop it from doing so, and we know that +1 will always win, but we defined E_0 so it can't win, so E_0 has to always win too
there is a conflict
so, we resolve it by making our logical system far more powerful
so far we have considered a single logic, and this logic has worked all the way up until E_0
(we have used classical logic)
however, now we will have to consider others to progress
so what we do is we create a sort of "all encompasing collection of logics"
we call this u*, bare with me here
now, we call an individual logic i*
classical logic is an example of an individual logic
but another example of an i* is a definition
every definition have its own i*
i*s can be consistent with eachother
the i* of an object is shown as i*(object)
u* is sort of the ultimate logic which we use to "govern" all i* and decide which we take to be true
now let me show you an example
A is defined as "A>B"
B is defined as "B>A"
now, their i*s contradict. i*(A) thinks that A is bigger than B, but i*(B) thinks that B is bigger than A
contradicting logics
u* has to find a way to resolve contradicting logics by picking one to be the truer one, i will explain this more in a sec
now, i*(E_0) thinks that E_0+1 = E_0, however i*(+1) thinks that for all objects, +1 makes it bigger, so here again is 2 conflicting i*
u* is a logical system in and of itself, it's the one we use in HO, it has some more complex principles i will explain later on, but the first one we learn is called definitional strength, and it's the tool we use to resolve these conflicts
u* is designed to be maximally "neutral" while still allowing for very strong and fucked stuff, so it doesn't have any weird distortions that don't seem "platonically correct", for example you won't find that it allows things like 0=1
but anyway, let's just start with definitional strength for now, it's all we need to know rn
definitional strength allows for some i* to have their logic be stronger than others, this means that we allow some things to be able to define

themselves to be stronger, this might be done explicitly, or it might be implicit as a consequence of another part of the definition
so, let me introduce the most basic way of adding definitional strength
it is called i(), don't get this confused with i*, they are annoyingly simillar
so we have i(0), i(1), i(2).....
basically what i(0) does is that when placing it in a definition, it says "has a definitional strength larger than all objects which don't have any level of i(n)"
then what i(1) does is that it says "has a greater definitional strength than things with an i(0)", and the pattern continues with i(2), i(3), and so on
so each level of i() "ignores" the last, i stands for ignorance
now at this level we can literally define something to have a very strong definitional strength but later on what happens is that things start to get more complex and the claim of having a certain definitional strength itself is a claim that can be overpowered by some other i*, don't worry about that rn, it's just important to understand that we don't literally reduce the entirety of HG to getting the next level of i()
now
let's go back to E_0
"+1" does not have any level of i(), it's just a basic i* with no enhancing additions to it
so what we can do is we can define E_0 with i(0) to "overpower" the i* of +1
so we can have "E_0 is the least number where E_0 = E_0+1, i(0)"
now, we've just made it in u* so that there's no more paradox or conflict
the power of adding 1 doesn't have any i(), so it's overpowered by E_0
so
here are a few weird properties of E_0
E_0 > E_0
but, E_0 =/= E_0
and it's not true that E_0 < E_0
this is weird to think about
but it makes sense once you get the nature of E_0
ok so we've now broken things down until we've exhausted classical logic and had to jump to something stronger
so how do we get past E_0?
well, we use i() again
since E_0 only uses i(0), it can be overpowered with i(1)
so we can create a new form of +1 that uses i(1), so that we can get past E_0
i will call this uhh +1^{i(1)} ig
so usually our +1 has no level of i(), but +1^i(1) is enhanced with an i(1)
so, the next thing after E_0 is E_0+1^i(1)
which overpowers E_0 because it only uses i(0) whereas our +1 here has an i(1)
now, after we get E_0+1^i(1), we've already broken the "anti +1 defence" of E_0, so we can actually just use a regular +1 on this to go further
(E_0+1^i(1))+1
(E_0+1^i(1))+2
(E_0+1^i(1))+3
and so on
then we get, E_1, which is the next biggest number after E_0 such that +1 does not make it bigger, again it only requires i(0), since once we can get (E_0+1^i(1))+1, (E_0+1^i(1))+2 and so on after E_0, E_1 is the next point where adding 1 doesn't get you further

so the hierarchy goes like this
E_0 < E_0+1^i(1) < (E_0+1^i(1))+1 < (E_0+1^i(1))+2 < (E_0+1^i(1))+3... << E_1
E_1 uses i(0), which is sufficient
it doesn't require any new tricks
it's just the next E_0-like thing past E_0
it's the next +1 fixed point after E_0, if you know what fixed points are
E_1 requires no new logic or anything, the u* system is extremely powerful to the point where even E_39023548 logical jumps further it still works (although we do have to introduce a few new principles to it)
after all this E_ stuff is where things start to truly get cool, the number after all this E_ stuff is actually an extremely important milestone in HG, then we aren't far from A_0, which is the turning point where HG goes from "mildly cool" to "mindbending and incredible", then after that it only gets better and better

PART 4

once we've reached E_1, since we only required i(0) to make it (since we're just finding the limit of doing +1 on E_0+1^i(1), +1s have no ignorance that we need to overpower), we can use i(1), so we can do E_1+1^i(1), then we can use normal +1 again since we surpassed the +1 restriction again with just the +1^i(1), so then we get (E_1+1^i(1))+1, (E_1+1^i(1))+2, (E_1+1^i(1))+3.... then, E_2 is the next point where we can't get further by doing +1
then we get E_3, E_4, E_5, and so on
we can even reach crazy things like E_E_0 and E_E_E.....E_0
with every E_, we managed to surpass it with a +1 enhanced with an i(1), which we notated as +1^i(1)
1-E_0 is so big, that 1-E_0+1^i(1) = 1-E_0
we can also notate 1-E_0 as E(1,0), since that's easier
to get past E(1,0), we have to use a +1 enhanced with i(2), which surpasses E(1,0)s i(1) barrier
so we get E(1,0)+1^i(2)
then we can do what we did before
(E(1,0)+1^i(2))+1, (E(1,0)+1^i(2))+2, and so on
the next limit of stacking, as we did with E_n, is E(1,1)
we can repeat and do the same stacking with +1^i(2), the next limit of stacking is E(1,2)
so this structure is just the same as E_n but shifted up to E(1,0)
then we get E(2,0), which cannot be surpassed with +1^i(2)
we can get the same stackings by doing +1^i(3) and get E(2,1), E(2,2), and so on
then E(3,0) can't be surpassed with +1^i(3)
we continue on with E(4,0), E(5930,3945), and so on
then we can even do things like E(E_0,0)
or E(E(E(...),0),0)
after this, a whole hierarchy of further E_ extensions exist
there is a whole huge world of it
this is just the very beginning, E(E(E(...),0),0) is absolutely tiny to even the low-mid level of HG, you could not even begin to understand what things will become later
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

PART 5

there is a shit ton of E extensions
the amount of extensions is huge
however, absolutely no amount of extensions, not even the absolute limit of all extensions can even compare in the slightest to what we will cover
like this gap is so big that we have not been able to bridge it, no matter how fucking hard we extend E_, we create some insane sorta-extensions which are way beyond the limit of extensions
now ok this part will be pretty weird
i have to talk about what formality is
think about abstraction, all of mathematics can be reduced to sets of basic, almost alogrithmic rules
formality is when something can be reduced to almost what you could think of as code
for example take something like a+b
- if b=0 then a+b=0
- else, a+b = S(a+(b-1))
this is an example, but it's still not reduced all the way (typo, i am tired)
S() here is just sucessor function (+1)
we can literally reduce this further to where it's just a string of symbols being manipulated
formal languages are just collections of symbols, and then rules on how they interact
an example of a formal language is:
symbols: A, B
rules:
AA = B
AB = BA
ABA = BBA
BB = A
this may seem pointless, but everything you could think of as of now can be reduced to it, addition for example
even our number system is easily reducible to a formal language, we have 9 symbols, and then certain rules on what they mean when placed in a certain order
it's like the pure fundamental building blocks of everything
formal things can be reduced to some string of symbols if complex enough in a formal language
take something like E_0, even though it's crazy its still formalisable, it's reducible in the end to a list of basic, pure code defining how it works, we just need to define +1, and then E_0 is just reduced to E_0+1
this formality stuff is pre-existing, so i hope i am not butchering it, i'm just trying to explain it in an intuitive way
but yeah, think about it as breaking things down repeatedly until we find their fundamental pure states
for example, let's check if "red" is formal.
we can break red down to "light, has wave length 700 nanometers"
then we break down what light is, down to its pure physical properties, then we break physics down to its pure mathematical foundations, then we break that down until it's literally a string of binary, then we can do the same for wave, length, 700, and nanometers
but eventually, through all of that, we will end up with some pure reduced state, just a long string of 1001010100....
F_0 is the least number large enough such that it is unformalisable. it is so big that there cannot exist some pure reduction to the fundamental

basics, you can think of it as something so big that at a fundamental level it is slightly fucked, just ever so slightly fuzzy, no matter how many steps of "reduce further" you did, you'd never be able to find its basic building blocks. as a consequence of this, it is greater than any formalisable number, any number you can find, no matter how complex and large it is, if you can reduce it down to its pure fundamental components, it is lesser than F_0.
F_0 is so ineffably huge that it messes with the core properties of what it means for something to be "abstract" in the slightest, we are messing with the very foundations of metaphsyics itself.
but, this does not mean that everything past F_0 is subjective and illogical. remember how E_0 broke classical logic? welp, we just used u*, u* gives us an oppertunity to explore any idea we want in an individual concept without it fucking with everything else
so, ironically, we can still go about things starting at F_0 in a way that's just as objective and pure as we've done with anything else
however we need to add a new principle of u*, this is the 2nd one i will introduce. our first one dealt with stuff that broke certain kinds of logic, this one will deal with i*s that break certain core principles of the abstract world
this is a bigger logical leap than anything we have seen so far, mainly because this is beyond what logic even means at a fundamental level
imagine starting at 0, you make a logical leap and you end up at w, make another logical leap and you end up at E_0, make another one and you end up at ???, make another one and you end up at ???, you keep going, no matter how many of these you do, you will never ever be able to reach F_0, F_0 is the absolute supremum of what logic even is at the most pure and foundational level
we're not creating any new logic here, u* is always there to cover whatever destruction we do, otherwise all of this would be an absolute nonsensical meaningless mess
anyway, there is a small extension to F_0 that is very tame in comparison to the leap we had to make to F_0 but it's worth mentioning
imagine some formal language-like thing that was strong enough to make F_0 formalisable under it
F_1 would then be unformalisable under that
then imagine a new system capable of formalising F_1, F_2 would be unformalisable under that
so F_0 is fucked that the level that everything before F_0 is pure at, F_1 is fucked at the level that F_0 is pure at, F_2 is fucked at the level that F_1 is pure at, and so on
we can get F_w, F_absolute infinity, F_E_0 (so big that it's level is as big as the level after it), F_F_0 (so big that its very level is unformalisable), F_F_E_0, F_F_F_0, and so on

PART 6

F_0 is so big that you can't even define it by usual standards, i mean using u* we can define it, but with almost any other logic it would be impossible
in the future, i will actually delve way more into F_0, since there are some extremely imporatnt properties to it, but that will be far into the future
now, i have to discuss one of my least favourite numbers, but it's important
it's called itnumber
it's based off V&D's itfield, if you know what that is, because they have very simillar definitions

itnumber is simply defined as "the largest number"
this includes formalisable numbers, unformalisable numbers, definable numbers, undefinable numbers, thinkable numbers, unthinkable numbers, and so on
"but there can't be a largest number!"
exactly, but, the i* of itfield thinks its the largest number
now, to surpass itnumber, it's extremely easy, we simply have to use our old friend i(), and this is just about the last place it comes up
since itnumber has no definitional strength, it's just "largest number", we can surpass it with a simple "least number larger than itnumber, i(0)", essentially bypassing the "there's no numbers larger than itnumber" restriction
this is known as itnumber_1
and this perhaps is the absolute best example of definitional strength
itnumber is defined as the largest number, but has no definitional strength, therefore itnumber_1 which has a definitional strength of 1 can overpower the logic of itnumber, making itself bigger
then we can get itnumber_2, which is "least number larger than itnumber_1", we don't need an i() for this since itnumber_1 didn't claim itself to be the biggest number, it just claimed itself to be bigger than itnumber
we can continue with itnumber_2 and so on
then, 1-itnumber is defined as "the largest number, i(0)", it's the next "largest number" past itnumber, and to surpass it we have to use i(1), we do this with 1-itnumber_1 which is defined as "least number larger than 1-itnumber, i(1)"
then we get 1-itnumber_2, and the same pattern continues
after that we get 2-itnumber, which is defined as "largest number, i(1)", surpassing anything else with i(1), and needing an i(2) to surpass
we can continue on with 3-itnumber, 4-itnumber, and so on
now this is basically just the E_ hierarchy over again
which is why it's kinda boring
but it is neccesary
we can also get extensions like strongly-itnumber, which also claims that it has the largest definitional strength, suprassed by "i actually have the largest definitional strength, i(0).. which backs its definitional strength up with a definitional strength
now i will talk about MPR
MPR is short for maximal paradox resistence
it's a tool like i() that we can add to our definitions
it is essentially the maximally powerful definition strength
defined as "the most strongest definition strength, ignores anything which would prevent it from being so"
it simply just ignores i(), any extensions to i(), or anything else
it's like the most ultimate "fuck you, i win"
you cannot make any extension to MPR
it's quite literally just "if you make something stronger than me, i will literally ignore you"
it's complete and absolute power
now i will talk about an absolutely monumental milestone, it encompasses everything we have talked about so far, completely dwarfs everything we've discussed.
it's very simply defined as "the largest number, MPR"
this is called A_0

now i am very aware that some of this wording coming up sounds kinda crankish or nonsensical, but it's merely an informal attempt to get across the size of A_0, it's the best i can do:

A_0 is complete and utter maximality, it's absolute totality. A_0 genuinely represents the quantity of the things in "everything", it is not bound by logic, reason, meaning, or any other restrictions. A_0 is larger than anything logical, illogical, meaningfull, meaningless, thinkable, unthinkable, definable, undefinable, no matter the definitional strength, the complexity of the definition, or any other factor.

now, i know this sounds like a whole bunch of word salad, but i genuinely do need to phrase things like this, because otherwise it's really hard to get across how big A_0 really is, you need to understand that it is complete totality, it encompases everything that "is" or "is not".

but.... we can go beyond..... this presents a massive turning point in HG, here's where things in my opinion start to get extremely interesting, after this is where the theory side of HG starts to really develop. things past A_0 are called transmaximal, they exist outside everything, they surpass the concept of the absolute, which to some might sound nonsensical but please keep an open mind, they have very valid and interesting reasons for their existence, which i will go into depth about in the next part, be prepared for where things really do start to become fucked, this is where it goes from "meh" to extremely interesting.

PART 7

now, a lot of things in this part are going to be quite philosophical, and also there are things brought up that you will not believe in, but the point is that although you don't have to believe in it, you just have to asume its existence as it leads to more powerful and concrete ideas. the explination for this part is also especially informal, this is due to 2 factors, the first is that it's incredibly hard to explain something like this formally, it's just too abstract. the 2nd factor is that as i say later, this part is not really formalised at all yet, but definetely will be in future. to some this will come across as just complete nonsense, if you see it that way you are missing the point, we are philosophically assuming these concepts and then using collapse, we can actually find genuine usable versions of them which have very interesting and useful properties (i will explain collapse later), anyway.
so now i have to introduce a concept that you might have heard of, and it might seem not all that relevent rn but i will explain later why this is important. this, like itnumber, is also something linked to V&D, infact the last thing we'll see form V&D (a few HGists were also V&Dists), but it was quite a contreversial idea for reasons i will explain later
ok so it's called reality levels, or RL for short. the 0th reality level contains everything conceptual/exists metaphysically (some might use the word fictional, although that can be a slight misnomer). the 0th reality level is sort of complex and philosophical as to what it really is, so i won't get into that rn, just deal with my informality. the 1st reality level, this contains the world in which we exist and create 0th reality level ideas such as E_0.
it's the one in which we are talking about these concepts
now, here's something, it's called transfictionalism, and no sane person would believe it genuinely exists, but keep in mind that is not the point, you have to assume its existence. this is very important, because i don't think anyone would seriously believe that transfictionalism really exists, you have to suspend belief of its existence (like you would with like idk an inacessible cardinal, you don't have to believe they exist irl for you to study the idea of them). transfictionalism is

the concept of some 0th reality level concept "crossing into" a 1st reality concept. an object is transfictional if posing its existence within the 0th reality level causes its existence within the 1st reality level
but if you want a more informal/intuitive explination, think of it like this
what's the strongest possible thing you could think of? something with E_0 power? something with A_0 power?
if you thought of something transfictional, you would see it show up irl.
a concept is transfictional if being an element of 0th reality level implies it is an element of the 1st reality level.
it's a fairly dumb idea but actually extremely important. it's not simply just stuff we think of, i think that's a small misconception, it could be anything, just naturally existing as an abstract concept would cause it's existence within the 1st reality level. if "i have wings rn" was a transfictional statement, i would literally have wings
but here's where collapse comes in. when i say "i have wings, i mean this transfictionally"... i still don't have wings, this is called collapse, it's a sort of "reduced" version of some concept that happens when speaking of these things
i don't have wings, due to collapse, the idea of transfictionalism is collapsed
if it wasn't collapsed, i'd genuinely have wings right now, which is impossible. so collapse allows us to talk about ideas which are genuinely impossible. it's a concept that allows us to "model" concepts too strong to be within the 0th reality level, by creating some reduced version.
now, here's where it becomes important
transfictionalism, even when collapsed, allows us to go beyond A_0
firstly let's examine "uncollapsed transfictionalism" (this is clearly impossible, but just imagine it could exist)
we can easily prove that uncollapsed transfictionalism would clearly beat A_0
you can think of a character with A_0 power, but that reality level 0 character is still within reality level 0
i mean, it didn't break out of reality level 0 did it
however if an uncollapsed character with transfictional power were to exist, it would be strong enough to break out of reality level 0
now, what we have to do is show that this idea still beats A_0 when collapsed
beacause transfictionalism has to be collapsed
to do this, i need to introduce a new concept
it's called awareness
awareness is basically what some definition quantifies over
it's slightly more subtle than that, though
it only really shows up at the post itfield level
you can think of awareness as what a definition "accounts for"
let's look at A_0
A_0 is within reality level 0
when it says "everything", it genuinely is everything, which from the POV of a reality level 0 concept would be all of reality level 0
it's not "aware" of things outside of it
think about you irl when you say everything
when you say everything, you mean all of reality
since that's all you can be aware of
now
when collapsing transfictionalism, its awareness remains
it has awareness of reality level 1 (i mean it's literally defined by that)

we're explicitly stating about reality level 1
that's now included within the set of things that it can quantify over
this is uh a lot to take in, so i'm trying to explain it as clearly as possible, i apologise if i'm not doing a good job
- "everything" means all of reality level 0 (we can talk about the concept of "everything" irl, when defining "everything" it doesn't somehow escape into reality level 1, so we know that "everything" can be neatly contained within reality level 0)
- "everything" refers strictly to reality level 0, and does not quantify over reality level 1, making its awareness be strictly reality level 0
- transfictionalism's definition specifically references reality level 1, so wether collapsed or not it has awareness of reality level 1
- this means that transfictionalism can quantify over more than reality level 0, making it be able to quantify over more than everything. we can shorten reality level 0 to RL0 and reality level 1 to RL1. idk why i didn't just say that earlier
now we are going to talk about some more concepts you must suspend disbelief for (this goes for literally everything past this point, this is what seperates genuine interesting study from literal insanity crankery type stuff)
let's pose the existence of something that is to RL1 as RL1 is to RL0, this would essentially be something that sees us as abstract conceptual ideas, it's called RL2.
within RL0, nothing you do in there can ever force it out into RL1, due to collapse, RL2 is so strong that within RL1, nothing you can do in here could ever get you to RL2, this means if someone irl had A_0 power (like the fictional character we talked about in RL0 did), they would be surpassed with RL2
we can continue this on into RL3, RL4, and so on.
A_0 is the supremum to RL0, it is the most powerful concept that could exist within RL0. A_1 is the supremum of RL1, meaning that it's more powerful than anything transfictional, then A_2 is the supremum of RL2, meaning that it's more powerful than anything that is some stronger variant of transfictional, as in RL1->RL2 instead of RL0->RL1. we can continue with A_1, A_2, A_3...
A_0 is absolute true maximality, A_1 is maximal-like, but so strong that it dwarfs even absolute maximality, these concepts beyond maximal are called transmaximal, A_1 and beyond are transmaximal.
and as always, we can do A_A_0, A_A_A_0, and so on.
TDLR; we made numbers bigger than the last number.

PART 8

ok well first
i think i should talk about transmaximal quantification first
let's examine an argument as to why A_0>A_1
"A_0 is greater than all numbers, A_1 is a number, therefore A_0 is greater than it"
at first this may look like a convincing argument
can you see why this is wrong though?
the reason this is wrong is because A_1 is not within the class of "all"
we know that all is a reality level 0 concept (infact the absolute limit of reality 0), since we don't require collapse, we can freely talk about it without having to use collapse to stop it from escaping into real life or something
A_1 requires collapse, it cannot even be classed within "all"
A_0 is beyond all numbers, keyword all

sometimes it's even worded trickily like "if there is a number, it is lesser than A_0", this might look like this argument doesn't work on disproving it but if you look closely this is just a direct rewording of "all numbers are lesser than A_0"
so yeah, that's this argument disproven
i'll talk a little more about collapse now
about what collapse "is"
so, collapse isn't restricted to reality levels
it starts at reality levels
but it exists beyond that
collapse is the name we give to when our system cannot do as intended due to some conflict of how real life works vs our system, by realising this it actually has a ton of uses, essentially it's just when you can't make something actually happen, so when i say "there will be 5 elephants in your room", this statement is collapsed, as there are not actually 5 elephants in your room.
what this does is that it takes inconsistencies between the systems of HG and actual real life, and it creates some "bridge" that, not unlike u*, allows us to create consistency, as collapse gives us a direct tool for "translation" between the 2. without collapse, we would say "well you don't have 5 elephants in your room so the systems are inconsistent", with collapse what instead happens is that we say "well, without collapse you would have 5 elephants in your room, but collapse translates that concept into a model of actual real life within HG".
this is quite a tricky concept so it might take some time to get used to how it really works, but if you want a simple understanding, it's just the reason that certain things don't actually happen, and it allows for these things to still be meaningful without them needing to really happen, by creating some kind of collapsed variant of actual real life.
oh yeah, and btw instead of having A_1 be collapsed, we can just have the concept of reality levels be collapsed, which is exactly the same in practice but just makes things easier to talk about.
so, here we are, we've now gotten to A_1, A_2, A_3... A_A_0 (the maximal level of A_), A_A_1 (the first transmaximal level of A_), A_A_A_0, A_A_A....
if you are famillar with V&D, A_A_0 is r(max)eality, the limit of all A_ including things like A_A_...A_0 is authorlock, essentially authorlock is inacessible to reality levels.
ok, so now i'll go over one of serge's concepts, it's called supposability.
essentially, when doing things like transfictionalism, we have to "suppose" them to exist, since yunno there probably aren't concepts that can really break into real life
this is called 0-supposing
if you 0-suppose something, it's like "well this probably isn't a concept that actually exists but i'll suppose it exists because it has genuine important consequences and leads to powerful concepts"
now this is really strong
all of the methods we've got so far can be 0-supposed
you can 0-suppose that 2nd reality level exists
meaning that you can reach A_2 from 0-supposability
you can just do some replacement and use 0-supposability to get you to A_A_A_...
now, 1-supposable concepts are things that you can't even 0-suppose them to exist, you have to suppose that you can suppose them... suppose is starting not to sound like a word
essentially these are unthinkable things

it's basically like "well i know that i wouldn't be able to think this, but i am going to suppose that i could"
then 2-supposable things are concepts that you have to suppose that you could 1-suppose them, these are things that you know you couldn't even think about thinking, and therefore you just have to "suppose" that you could
0-supposable: idk if these could exist or not but i'll assume they could to see where the idea leads to
1-supposable: we couldn't even think about this, but i'll assume that i can think about it, just to see where it leads to
2-supposable: we couldn't even think about thinking about this, but i'll assume i can think about thinking about it, just to see where it leads to
and so on
see, think about it this way, we couldn't really think about transmaximal things since they would somehow "break into real life", so we had to use collapse and think about thinking about them, those things are 0-supposable, but with 1-supposable things, we can't even do this, we can't even think about thinking about them and we had to instead think about thinking about thinking about them, and so on with 2-supposable, 3-supposable, etc
ok, so here's why this is powerful, the limit of 0-supposability is called S_0, this is greater than anything we were able to reach with supposability, for example take A_A_0, can we think about it genuinely? no, so instead we have to think about thinking it, but we don't need to go any further, as long as we can think about thinking about it, it's 0-supposable, therefore A_A_0<S_0, since S_0 is greater than anything 0-supposable
then we get the 1-supposable things that we have to think about think about thinking, since they're so powerful that even thinking about thinking about them would have to be collapsed, and then the limit of all 1-supposable things is S_1
then the limit of 2-supposable things is S_2, and the limit of 3-supposable things are S_3
annddd so on
then we can get the maximal level of S, which is S_A_0, then the first transmaximal level of it which is S_A_1, then the first 1-supposable level of it which is S_S_0, and then we can continue on with S_S_S_0, S_S_S_S_0 and so on as we always could
ok, so after supposability we have one more concept before we hit our next major milestone
it's called submetaness
so far, with all of our concepts, we've been talking about what they're like in reality, and due to collapse they don't actually have that behaviour, so when we talk about transfictionalism, although it claims to affect reality, it doesn't really
same goes for supposability
with 1-supposable things, it claims that you can't even think about thinking about them, but in reality, we managed to literally just think about it directly, this is again because of collapse
things within the 1st submetaness layer have awareness of the fact that when they "affect reality", they cannot actually affect it, and they claim to still be able to affect it anyway, essentially they claim to "break through" the barrier of collapse. they're like "ok so these things didn't actually affect reality but for real this time i can"
and yet still, these things cannot really affect reality at all, it still failed... things within the 2nd submetaness layer are aware of that, and they again claim to do so anyway

this concept is defined through our friend awareness, "the n+1th submetaness layer contains as an element of its awareness set the u*-statement that the nth submetaness layer is an element of sRL0, and the n+1th submetaness layer contains the i*-statement that it is not an element of sRL0" don't worry about what this means but it's just an example of what an actual definition looks like in HG since we're being so informal rn.
essentially, each submetaness layer has the awareness that the previous is collapsed, and it says that "actually this time, fr, i'm not collapsed!!", and then the next submetaness layer is like "ok so that guy was collapsed but for realll this time i'm not collapsed"
(there's a concept wayyyy later on called MRL-unsoundness that's sorta like this but instead of simply not being collapsed, its saying that when it is inevitably collapsed, its collapse will have to be collapsed itself, we'll get to this far later but i just wanted to bring this up now, it's like the difference between 1+x=x and x+1=x, which is the difference between w and E_0)
the difference between layers and levels is that levels are like classes in which certain objects exist, layers are properties that a certain definition has, so we can have something like "A_4 but on the 4th submetaness layer rather than the 0th", i'll get to this in a sec
so, after all of this S_ stuff, we get 1-A_0
layers and levels are conventions within HG that are used commonly, soon you'll see thought levels, existence levels, awareness layes, metaness layers (different from submetaness layers, these are far stronger)
anyway, so basically what 1-A_0 does, is that it sees that A_0 managed to have numbers larger than it, and it does A_0 again but shifted up by 1 submetaness layer, so it takes into account everything that surpassed A_0 and says "well you all managed to surpass A_0, but this time i genuinely mean that i'm the limit of all numbers, for real this time"
so 1-A_0 has the same definition with one extra part added on, it's "the biggest number, MPR, including all those on the 0th submetaness layer", 0th submetaness layer is just things that aren't even aware that they aren't affecting reality, so 1-A_0 is A_0 "powered up by" the awareness of all things on 0th submetaness layer
remember, things on the 1st submetaness layer basically say "you didn't actually affect reality, but this time i actually do", so A_0 shifted up by 1 submetaness layer is saying "i'm the biggest number including all of those numbers that thought they affected reality when they didn't", it's like the next absolute past A_0, it's greater than all things on the 0th submetaness layer
this might be confusing but don't worry because it makes a lot more sense at 1-A_1
1-A_1 is A_1 again shifted up to the 1st submetaness layer, remember that A_1 factored into account all transfictional methods, so 1-A_1 is saying "ok well transfictionalism didn't actually bleed into reality, but this it actually will bleed into reality"
so things with a 1- are boosted by a level of actuality
it's like "last time this didn't actually happen, so this time it really will happen"
ok but we still see that 1-A_1 didn't really bleed into reality
so 2-A_1 is A_1 but shifted up to the 2nd submetaness layer, it says "1-A_1 wasn't really big enough to bleed into reality but this time i really actually am big enough to bleed into reality"
n-A_0 is kinda tricky to understand but just think of it as the one bigger than all of the ones on the previous submetaness layer

so whereas 1-A_1 is big enough to "fr this time bleed into reality!!", 1-A_0 is just bigger than all of those things that tried and failed to really bleed into reality
but we know that 1-A_1 and higher also failed, so 2-A_0 is bigger than all those things that failed for the second time, and 2-A_1 thinks that it really didn't fail this time, then the cycle continues with 3-A_0, and so on
A_0 < A_1 < A_2... A_A_0 < A_A_A_0..... < S_0 < S_1 < S_2... S_S_0, S_S_S_S_0..... < 1-A_0 < 1-A_1 < 1-A_2..... < 2-A_0 < 3-A_0.....
each -A_0 is a higher level of absoluteness
well absoluteness is a misnomer
A_0 was already complete and utter total absoluteness, this is an even stronger concept
brief recap:
A_0: absolute maximality
A_1: so big it'd have to bleed into reality, we went into this in detail
S_0: even though things like A_1 shouldn't be able to be thought of, we managed to think of thinking of them, this is so big that you can't think of thinking of it and you have to think of thinking of thinking of it
S_1: now you have to think of thinking of thinking of... i've lost track, but you get the idea
1-A_0: actually screw that, none of those things actually managed to actuallyyyyy bleed into real life and were collapsed, this contains all of those things
1-A_1: and now this time it really does manage to bleed into real life, even if it failed last time
2-A_0: nvm, even that failed, this contains all those things that failed a second time
2-A_1: ok so this one now fr this time bleeds into reality
3-A_0: anddd that still failed
and so on
next time, i'll have to teach some more theory in depth, i'll teach what THO is, what principle of discollapse is, antiformality more in depth, and we might reach our next huge miletsone if i have enough time. before A_0 was meh, this stuff is very cool, and then the next stuff is in my opinion nothing short of incredible. so, see you next time.

PART 9

today i'm going to go into a lot of theory
ok so now first we'll talk about THO
so, remember u*? u* is basically something that governs over conflicts of definitions within HG, but it's actually one part of a far broader system, THO. essentially, THO is defining of the entire system of HG itself, it's like the metatheory of HG.
if HG is the physical world, THO is the rules of physics.
THO is basically the axioms of HG
THO is what defines HG itself
now
THO is essentially made up as a list of "rules", if you know what axioms are then these rules are just axioms
these rules/axioms are defined to be as platonically-correct as possible, meaning that they don't have weird nonsensical consequences that don't really make sense within our real world, we'll get into this later when we discuss MRL
so we don't have any rules like "numbers defined with the word "bacon" in them are bigger than numbers defined without the word "bacon" in them"

some people hear that "oh so it has it's own logic? well then you can't judge the concepts in HG to anything else because it plays by its own rules, what's even the point if it's all just under some weird rules", this is a very misinformed mindset.
all mathematics is based off sets of rules that define how things "work", you could even have crazy systems like "all blue cars are red cars" or whatever.
but the entire point is that THO is defined to be as neutral and as "close to real life" as possible, because when we deal with things at this level we need an extremely powerful system otherwise we end up in chaos, THO is defined to be as meaningful and as neutral and as powerful as possible.
so we know the first rule/axiom of THO is u*. it's the only thing we've learnt so far
and this axiom governs how different logic interacts
but now i'll go over a few other ones
oh yeah and we also talked about collapse, which is also an axiom/rule within THO
ok so the next axiom in THO is "axioms of THO cannot be hyperologically transcended"
if you forgot, HG = hyperology, this thing that we've been discussing the entire time
so essentially what this rule means is that no definition within HG can "overpower" THO, we do this by stating that HG definitions which claim to affect THO are collapsed, so this goes hand in hand with the axiom of collapse
essentially what this does is that it stops definitions from being like "hah! i can overpower all of u* and focre it to make me the biggest!", what it does here is state that this itself is collapsed and cannot actually affect u* in the same way transfictional things cannot actually break into reality.
if we don't have this rule, then we have HG definitoins literally redefining THO and all of the sudden we have no system to actually judge these HG things by
so the idea is that this means HG definitions can't "overpower" what THO says otherwise THO would be useless and all of the sudden we'd have no system to do things in.
we could have something like "i redefine u* to make me the biggest number" and something else like "i also redefine u* to make me the biggest number" and since HG would be able to genuinely affect THO we'd have no u* to judge what actually happens since it'd be being overpowered by these definitions, so including this axiom prevents that from happening and just says "yeah sure but you don't actually affect u*, you're collapsed"
and again, this doesn't make "i affect u* to make me the biggest number" an invalid number, it's still valid it's just collapsed, and again we know that collapse doesn't stop numbers from being big, it just shifts things down a level to stop them from fucking things up
"i overpower u* to make me the biggest number" is still big in the same way that A_1 is big even though it's collapsed, it just means that it's not actually the biggest number. collapse lowers the power to stop it from "overflowing" and spilling into reality/THO, it doesn't completely nerf things to where they're meaningless, infact every concept after A_0 is collapsed and they're still very big. collapse only reduces the power of things to the minimum extent, meaning claiming to do something is still strong since you're at least "aiming" for it, even if collapse stops you from getting 100% there
anyway so, so far we have the axioms of THO are:

1. u* exists
2. collapse exists
3. HG definitions that claim to affect THO are collapsed
quickly i want to go into THO-defined concepts
these are concepts defined axiomatically within THO, essentially they are "true" on the same level as THO, they are defined to be a part of THO.
numbers, for example, are THO-defined, this means that we can always have numbers work, there's no HG concept that can surpass them, this makes things far easier because it gives us a uniform easy formal way to measure power of concepts without ever "running out" of them.
you have to be careful when THO-defining, firstly by definition they are not HG concepts, since they are part of THO, and secondly you cannot have them be inconsistent to the "core" axioms of THO, for example those 3 axioms we have discussed rn are core axioms of THO, there are about 15 of them in total but we've only discussed 3, a THO-defined concept is not valid if it is inconsistent with any of those axioms and therefore is collapsed to HG.
THO-defined concepts are very very useful in HG definitions, when we use a THO-defined concept within a HG definition it will be collapsed clearly since it's within a HG definition and the 3rd core axiom of THO states that HG defined objects are collapsed to HG and cannot be THO.
so essentially we can THO define a concept, then we can use that concept within a HG definition, the use of that concept will be collapsed within the definitoin, this specific form of collapse is called a THO->HG collapse, and these types of collapses are very special and important, i'll go into them now
- THO axioms exist above all HG
- THO-defined concepts are concepts that are defined to be a part of THO, thus making them be true above all HG
- we cannot have any THO-defined concepts that are inconsistent with the major core axioms of THO
- when using a THO-defined concept within a HG definitoin, it will be collapsed, this type of collapse is called a THO->HG collapse
firstly it's important to remember awareness, go back and read if you forgot what that is.
the thing about THO-defined things is that because they exist above all HG, they have awareness of all HG.
so, if we defined "all" as a HG definition, it's only given the awareness specified in the definition, so it's just A_0 level.
however if we made a THO-defined concept "all", this would have awareness of all HG things, and all the crazy reality level stuff and all of our transmaximal methods, and it would mean all including all of that stuff we did in HG to go beyond all.
now, when collapsing THO-defined concepts, we get this very interesting phenomenon called awareness retention. this basically means that when a THO-defined concept is used within a HG definition, it's collapsed and it absorbs the awareness of the definitoin, so it's awareness is also collapsed too otherwise it could spill into THO, and because collapse always just does the maximum possible power it can do without it spilling over, the THO-defined concept will have the awareness of all the HG it knows about, which is just the HG in the definition.
so for example, let's call this THO-defined concept of all "ALL+", so normally in a THO-definition, ALL+ would include literally all HG and have the awareness of literally all HG, however in a HG definition this is collapsed to having the knowledge of the HG definition. let's define a concept like "the reality level bigger than ALL+ reality levels", if we just used all instead of ALL+ here, it'd default to the usual all which is just A_0, so this would just be the A_0th reality level, however

becuase we used ALL+, it takes in all the awareness that it can do since it's a THO-defined concept, so "the reality level bigger than ALL+ reality levels" would be bigger than all reality levels including numbers based off reality levels that go beyond the simple vanilla all.
- the awareness of THO-defined concepts must be collapsed when used in a HG definition otherwise it'd spill over into THO
- collapse always does the most powerful thing it can do without it spilling into THO/reality
- when a THO-defined concept is not collapsed, it contains absolutely all awareness of all HG
- however this must be collapsed
- therefore a THO-defined concept must take on the biggest possible awareness that it can do
- HG defintions are only aware of concepts that can be implied from their definition
- so a THO-defined concept's awareness when collapsed takes in all it can "know about", which is just all the things it can imply to exist, and since it exists within that HG definition, that's what it can imply to exist (as in, it's literally within that HG definition so therefore it existing must imply that the HG definitoin exists). so it has the awareness of the entire awareness of the definition.
don't worry too much if you don't understand the reasoning, just understand that the awareness of a THO-defined concept when collapsed is all the awareness of the definition it is within.
this is like how W works in OCFs if you know what those are, OCFs are just a googoology concept so don't worry if you don't know what it is but if you understand them then this is the analogy i'd use: W is something that exists outside what the psi() is capable of (psi() is analogous to HG here, and W being a THO-defined concept), so the W just "collapses" down to the biggest possible thing it knows about, which is the psi it's in, technically it does infinite recursions of that but don't worry about that.
psi(W+W) = psi(W+psi(W+...))
this is like how awareness retention works in THO->HG collapses, this is a very neat and intuitive thing once you get why it works, it's extremely useful in HG definitions too
but yeah, that's it for today

PART 10

we talked about a few axioms
now i'm going to talk about the next 2 vital axioms, MRL and MA
MRL is the THO, uncollapsed concept of the world in which we live and exist and do HG
so you know how when we talk about "reality"
we're really talking about a collapse of reality
like when we say "breaks into reality" it doesn't actually because that "reality" is collapsed
MRL is the actual uncollapsed reality we're in thinking about these concepts rn
like look around you for a sec, that's MRL
now, just as we can do with any THO concept, we can use a collapsed version in HG, infact collapses of MRL are used all the time in mid-high level HG
but MRL serves the purpose of being the genuine world in which we can do HG, and as the 3rd axiom we leant states, THO concepts cannot be "hyperologically transcended", this means that there's no HG concept that can go above/break into MRL, if we allowed for such things we'd be

getting checked out as a mental hospital because it'd mean that we genuinely thought we could affect this actual reality
MRL stands for "mundane real life", it's where all HG "comes from", as it's where we're making and discussing HG
this brings me onto MA, which is more of a guidline than an axiom
since we're discussing stuff involving the actual real world, we have to be very very careful that we do not allow for any antiscientific or delusional practice
this is where MA comes in, MA stands for "mundane assumptions", these are the every day beliefs we go about with in MRL to be functional members of society
parts of MA would be "there isn't an elephant in my room in MRL rn" and "transfictional entities cannot exist within MRL"
and we assume these to be true as parts of THO, it may seem dumb that we even have to state that, but if we're going to create a concept of MRL we better be sure we don't open the door to delusional/antiscientific practices
now again, this is not to say we cannot use a collapse of HG in MRL since remember, collapses create "pseudo versions" of concepts, almost like a fictionalisation. a collapse of MRL wouldn't really be about the actual MRL, it'd be about some faux version of MRL, not the genuine MRL.
now if you were to have a concept that's a collapse of MRL, you may just think that this is RL1 (reality level 1), right? however, since MRL is a THO concept, when collapsing you get a THO->HG collapse as i discussed before, these types of collapse can adjust to be as strong as the definition it's in. RL1 is obviously not a THO->HG collapse, it's just the plain standard concept of "reality" with no THO fuckery going on, it's always gonna have the same level of awareness/power. so like when we have submetaness for example we can create some stronger version of RL1 using submetanses, however with MRL it'd already adjust to the submetaness within the definition, becoming that level of power/awareness, you wouldn't have to shift it up with everything else. for example: "biggest number in RL1, where this definition has 5-submetaness shift", you're still only using RL1, it's only gonna be A_1 level, since we're not actually shifting up RL1 by 5-submetaness we're just shifting the definition up. RL1 is always going to be fixed in place, it doesn't get stronger as your definition gets stronger. however "biggest number in MRL, where this definition has a 5-submetaness shift", MRL is not fixed in place and will be as powerful as your definition, meaning that it does have a 5-submetaness shift
now i gotta get into the antiformality bit
remember F_0?
that was the first hint at this
first we establish the notion of HRFs (Hyperologically-Reductive Formalisms)
these are reductions of all current HG into a formalised system, think of it like taking all the individual neurons used when considering a HG concept, then reducing that to a formal string of binary or something
essentially they are formalisations of the creation of HG within MRL
so a HRF of a HG concept is like taking it as just a string of words, formalising the english language and how it interacts with a human brain, all the MRL circumstances that lead to them, atoms interacting, etc, then taking all that and formalising it
so like for example when we say "F_0 is unformalisable"
a HRF would be a sort of collapse/reduction, almost like "well you humans might think it's unformalisable but actually it is"
HRFs are literally just reductions of HG into formality
here's the next important axiom of THO

HRFs should not be considered meaningful, reasonable, or a proper representation of the concepts within HG
so essentially we're saying that a concept in HG is not it's HRF
something like supposability should not be taken as neurons firing in a human brain, but instead as the actual concept of supposability, we assume HRFs to be false representations of HG
if you know about formalism vs platonism, this essentially forces platonism, we assume platonism within THO, this is actually extremely important and not a choice based off belief, HG kinda stops working if we don't do this
a formalist would see a concept as just symbols on paper with no inherent meaning
however what we're saying is with HG concepts, you must assume that the literal definitions within MRL are not what the literal concepts are, and that defintions are purely "pointers"/"stand-ins" to the actual concepts
now, why is this important?
we're "forcing platonism"
now why is this axiom important
1. without it all HG would be <F_0
since, the literal definition within MRL are formalisable
if we take those to be the actual concepts then everything in HG is actually formalisable
meaning we'd never actually be able to go above F_0
which is cringe
so yeah, we need this otherwise all HG, even the stuff beyond A_0 that we've discussed, would be less than F_0
2. collapse would be meaningless
there's no such thing as a definition being a "collapse" of another one, they're just symbols on a screen
you can't have the concept of collapse without assuming that these concepts really exist
alright so yeah, important
here's the list of the THO axioms so far:
1. there exists some logical system u* which determines the truth of all individual logic within HG i*
2. there exists a notion of "collapse" which links abstract reductions of concepts to their fully realised counterparts
3. the axioms of THO cannot be transcended by HG (definitions within HG that claim to affect THO are collapsed)
4. there exists the notion of MRL
5. MA should be assumed at all times
6. HRFs are not meaningful representations of concepts within HG
i think fairly soon we can start getting back into some HG concepts
but rn it's important for me to discuss the theory
and yeah, that's it, see you

PART 11

the A+-realm is the THO-defined collection of all HG
it can be seen as the realm in which all HG exists
this is very important
it's simply just the collection of all HG, as simple as that
now if we said this within a HG definition, it'd be collapsed
so if in HG we said "collection of HG", it wouldn't actually be HG, there would be some stronger HG defintions that can somehow force itself outside of that
so we have to use THO to define it
to make sure we don't get any HG things overpowering it

i'm not gonna explain those just yet, i'll maybe get onto them later but they need some discussion with HGists because i'm not too fond of them
so finally, we can move onto some actual HG, now that we've explained in depth the theory behind HG (THO)
phew, ok so we last ended up at submetaness
like 1-A_0, A_0-A_0, and so on
now time to jump an unbelivable leap
∀-
this is the first serious milestone after A_0
∀- is defined as "the largest number that will ever be created within HG"
you can see how this mirrors A_0
A_0 is "largest number"
however within HG we have our methods of going beyond that
∀- is "largest number", including all of those complex methods we used to go beyond A_0, it's hyperologically absolute rather than just regular absolute
however, this is NOT the end
∀- is still simply an i* within HG, it can be transcended within HG
the limit of HG can be transcended within HG, yes
∀- is infact collapsed
A_0: vanilla absolute
A_1: becomes aware of reality and constructs concepts beyond the absolute
∀-: becomes aware of the hyperological process of defining larger and larger concepts even beyond the absolute, and serves as a limit as that.

however since ∀- is a definition within HG, it can be overpowered by greater definitions, which i have stated before
so we can get things like ∀- with 1 submetaness layer, which we call 1-∀- which is just "well ∀- was actually not the real limit of HG since it's collapsed, but i'm the real limit of HG now!!"
which again is collapsed so we can get next submetaness on ∀- after that which is 2-∀- and that's like "well 1-∀- was actually not the real limit of HG either but i am now fr!!"
kinda trivial but that's an example of something small past ∀-
oh here's something weird to keep in mind...
remember one of our axioms of THO was that you should take HG definitions as there actual concepts... so ∀- truly is the greatest thing us humans could ever get our minds together and come up with..... but HG is so fucked that we can transcend this notion itself. basically lol "all i* are true but some i* are more true than others".
this is really weird and uncomfortable at first, but you start to get used to it.
essentially we're not lowering HG's power, we're just strengthening THO even more. ∀- is the genuine limit of HG but it's not the THO-genuine limit... you can view this as a form of transmaximality again. ∀- is absolutely the greatest thing within HG but we have numbers that are transmaximal to this, it's weird and takes a mindset shift and i'm not really sure how to explain it well but i hope you can get used to it.
in the same way that A_0 is the biggest number and yet there are numbers bigger than it, ∀- is the biggest HG concept overall and yet there are greater HG concepts. this just strengthens HG even more, we can use it to describe our genuine absolute limits and yet even go beyond that
anyway so now i'm going to explain the next HG concept
Thought Levels
now this is where things are actually starting to get quite big
everything before ∀- is baby shit
thought levels essentially work in patterns of 3

thought level 0 contains definitions which have no awareness of reality, they are completely seperated and abstract, this can be seen as simply just reality level 0
thought level 0 is limited at A_0
thought level 1 is where we consider things that could somehow affect or transcend reality and find ways to model that within our mind, essentially thinking things that should be unthinkable, this is stuff that needs to be collapsed, it's stuff beyond A_0, and it's limited at ∀-
for example concepts like reality levels are perfect examples of definitions within thought level 1
thought level 2 is where we consider that we can model things too great to be modeled within our mind and then we try and find ways to model things that transcend that within our own mind, essentially when we realise HG as a process and then become meta about that, it contains definitions which are meta about HG, you can see that this starts at ∀-
we shorten thought level n to TLn
TL0: where we simply create concepts
TL1: things that are meta about reality
TL2: things that are meta about HG itself, including our concepts that were meta about reality
now there is a leap every 3rd level (well excluding TL0 this time)
every third level has some sort of transfictional leap
every third level sees the level before it, has awareness of that, and then says "alright, well what if something was strong enough to actually jump outside that process into MRL"
TL3 contains things so strong that if we were just going about our day, doing HG, obviously aware that all this stuff is just collapsed, and then somehow we created some concept so strong that it genuinely managed to break into MRL.
it's like if we were discussing some strong concept in HG and we joked around and said "{that concept}(there is an elephant in my room)" and then all of the sudden, somehow the concept passed through the A+-realm into MRL and there was an elephant in my room irl
now obviously, we know this is collapsed
because that can't actually exist irl
so
TL0: where we simply create concepts
TL1: things that are meta about reality
TL2: things that are meta about HG itself, including our concepts that were meta about reality
TL3: things that are somehow so strong that they genuinely break into HG, even when we know that concepts that "break out of HG" like reality levels are actually just collapsed
then after this the pattern of TL1, TL2, TL3 repeats
so we think about TL3 as our "new TL0"
wait no the pattern is shifted in an annoying way lol
it actually starts at TL1 grr
ok so we think about TL3 as our new TL1
then TL4 acts like the new TL2, in TL2 we knew that concepts we did in TL1 didn't actually affect reality and we realised that they were just part of the process of HG, with TL4 we realise that TL3 didn't really break into MRL and it was just part of HG, then we repeat that process and become meta about HG again, including the TL3 stuff
TL1: affects reality
TL2: nah but it didn't really tho, just a part of the broader HG narrative
TL3: ok but what about this time it really did break into reality
TL4: no that was again just part of HG

i realised my thought levels have a slightly different pattern in the fact that they do the pattern every 2 levels when originally it was every 3 levels but they're literally equal and this version makes more sense so then TL5 is the new TL3, it's where things would get "too powerful for HG" even by the standards of TL4, and then it'd "totally spill into MRL!!", then TL6 would do the same thing again where it realises that TL5 is infact still collapsed and still just a part of HG
but yeah, same pattern repeats just higher and higher
TL0 TL1 TL2 TL3 TL4 TL5 TL6 TL7 TL8.....
last thing
we call the limit of the nth thought level T(n)
T(0) = A_0
T(1) = ∀-
T(2) > ∀-
T(3) >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> T(2)
T(4) > T(3)
T(5) >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> T(4)
so yeah after TL0 we see that every second T() has a huge jump from the last one
thought levels are especially a complex concept and i think they're slightly needlessly complex but they are a nice next concept after ∀-
we still have a long long way to go
we got next up MRL-unsoundness, opux, hearsuit, existence levels, unitude/reflektion, ML, and then probably a shit ton of things i haven't even created yet
we are starting to catch up with ML which is the biggest thing i've done so far but hopefully by the time i get to that point i would have made other stuff beyond it

Hyperological Objects Above $\forall-$ and Below $\mathfrak{M}_{\dagger 1}$

EIG520, Goodels

February 26, 2023

With contributions from Asymetry, Kurante.

Abstract

The formalization of objects in Hyperology, or HG, is as of now significantly lower than ideal since a vast majority of the current information exists outside of a centralized location. There have been, and still are, many attempts at centralizing information, however many of these exist to provide beginners a place to learn, rather than to formalize (or at the very least increase formalization of) existing concepts. It is the aim of this paper to increase the formalization of Hyperological concepts below that of $\mathfrak{M}_{\dagger 1}$ and additionally introduce new concepts pertaining to sub $\mathfrak{M}_{\dagger 1}$ HG.

This document will not provide an introduction to the basics of Hyperology, it is a prerequisite to have read *Hyperology I*. Terms denoted with † have specific meanings separate from their english meanings, and are defined within *Hyperology I*.

1 ∀- to Thoughtlock

Term Definitions

Definition 1.1

Some hyperset† $\mathfrak{R}$ is a restrictional-hyperset if for some hyperset $\mathfrak{D}$ such that $\mathfrak{D}$ contains some definitions within the $\forall^{+}$-Realm†, $\mathfrak{R}$ contains properties as elements which are satisfied by all elements of $\mathfrak{D}$, and there is no property within $\mathfrak{R}$ which is not satisfied by any definition within $\mathfrak{D}$. Note: This definition should be taken as a THO-Definition† and will be collapsed† upon its usage within a Hyperological definition.

Definition 1.2

Some hyperset $\mathfrak{R}$ has definability under some restrictional-hyperset $\mathfrak{D}$ if all elements of $\mathfrak{R}$ satisfy all properties within $\mathfrak{D}$. Some object $\mathfrak{B}$ has definability under some restrictional-hyperset $\mathfrak{D}$ if $\mathfrak{B}$ is an element of some hyperset $\mathfrak{R}$ such that $\mathfrak{R}$ has definability under $\mathfrak{D}$. Note: This definition should be taken as a THO-Definition and will be collapsed upon its usage within a Hyperological definition.

Definition 1.3

Some hyperset $\mathfrak{R}$ is a definitional-realm if $\mathfrak{R}$ contains some definitions within the $\forall^{+}$-Realm such that $\mathfrak{R}$ has definability under some restrictional-hyperset $\mathfrak{D}$. Note: This definition should be taken as a THO-Definition and will be collapsed upon its usage within a Hyperological definition.

Definition 1.4

$\mathfrak{O}$ is a deflimit of some definitional-realm $\mathfrak{R}$ if $\mathfrak{O}$ is a definition within the $\forall^{+}$-Realm such that i*$(\mathfrak{O})^{\dagger}$ contains the i*-statement† that $\mathfrak{O}$ is greater than all other elements of $\mathfrak{R}$. Note: This definition should be taken as a THO-Definition and will be collapsed upon its usage within a Hyperological definition.

Definition 1.5

Some object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^{+}$-Realm is definable within some definitional-realm $\mathfrak{R}$ if $\mathfrak{O}$ is an element of $\mathfrak{R}$.

Definition 1.6

Thoughtrealm is the definitional-realm $\mathfrak{R}$ contains all elements within the $\forall^{+}$-Realm which are definable within some Thought Level.

Object Definitions

1. T(n) is defined as the deflimit of the n^{th} Thought Level.
2. ∀- is defined as T(1)
3. (∀-)* is defined as T(2)
4. Thoughtlock is defined as the deflimit of Thoughtrealm.

(Note: All objects collapsed by necessity)

2 Opux to Heartsuit^{+}

We will now cross a considerable gap. Currently the concept of collapse is in use which some readers may find confusing. So, allow this to serve as a reminder that all concepts mentioned here will be collapsed to a degree allowing their use in Hyperology. This section focuses around the idea of objects too large to be collapsed normally.

Term Definitions

Definition 2.2

An object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm is MRL-Inconsistent if $\mathfrak{O}$ has a collapse. Note: This definition should be taken as a THO-Definition and may be collapsed upon certain usages within a Hyperological definition.

Definition 2.3

An object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm is 0-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound if it is MRL-inconsistent, and the collapse of $\mathfrak{O}$ is MRL-inconsistent, and the collapse of the collapse of $\mathfrak{O}$ is not MRL-inconsistent.

Definition 2.4

For $n>0$, an object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm is n-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound if the collapse of $\mathfrak{O}$ is (n-1)-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound. For n, where n is a limit-number†, an object $\mathfrak{F}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm is n-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound if $\mathfrak{F}$ is x-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound for all $x<n$.

Definition 2.5

An object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm can be collapse-reduced to $\mathfrak{F}$ if there exists some number n within the $\forall^+$-Realm such that after collapse being applied n times, $\mathfrak{O}$ is euqal to $\mathfrak{F}$. Note: This definition should be taken as a THO-Definition and may be collapsed upon certain usages within a Hyperological definition.

Definition 2.6

An object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm is 0-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound if $\mathfrak{O}$ is MRL-inconsistent, and $\mathfrak{O}$ cannot be collapse-reduced to n-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsoundness for any n, and $\mathfrak{O}$ must be collapse-reduced only to 0-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsoundness.

Definition 2.7

For $n>0$, an object $\mathfrak{O}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm is n-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound if $\mathfrak{O}$ is MRL-inconsistent, and for all for $x<n$, $\mathfrak{O}$ cannot be collapse-reduced to some object $\mathfrak{F}$ within the $\forall^+$-Realm where $\mathfrak{F}$ is x-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound, and $\mathfrak{O}$ must be collapse-reduced only to n-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsoundness.

Object Definitions

1. Opux is defined as the least n large enough such that n must be 0-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound.
2. n-Opux is defined as the least x large enough such that it must be n-Weakly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound.
3. Heartsuit-Number is defined as the least n large enough such that n must be 0-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound.
4. n-Heartsuit is defined as the least x large enough such that it must be n-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsound.
5. Heartsuit-Number$^+$ is defined as the least x large enough such that for all n, it cannot be collapse-reduced to n-Strongly-$\mathfrak{U}$nsoundness.

(Note: All objects collapsed by necessity)

3 $\mathfrak{Exi}(2)$ to Existencelock

Term Definitions

Definition 3.1

For some definitional realms $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{A}$ is defheavier than $\mathfrak{B}$ if the THO-defined deflimit of $\mathfrak{A}$ is greater than the THO-defined† deflimit of $\mathfrak{B}$.

Definition 3.2

For some objects $\mathfrak{O}$ and $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{P}$ is an awareness-variant of $\mathfrak{O}$ if $\mathfrak{P}$ is minimally different from $\mathfrak{O}$ such that $\mathfrak{P}$ has a different awareness-set† than $\mathfrak{O}$.

Definition 3.3

For some objects $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{C}$, where $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are elements of the $\forall^{+}$-Realm and $\mathfrak{C}$ is THO-defined and uncollapsed, and where $\mathfrak{B}$ is the collapse of $\mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{A}$ is a $\diamondsuit$collapse of $\mathfrak{C}$ if $\mathfrak{A}$ is an awareness-variant of $\mathfrak{B}$.

Definition 3.4

A definitional realm $\mathfrak{R}$ is MRL-Reflecting if $\mathfrak{R}$ is a $\diamondsuit$collapse of MRL.

Definition 3.5

For some awareness $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{A}$ is $\diamondsuit$inaccessible if $\mathfrak{A}$ cannot be implied within u* from any awareness $\mathfrak{B}$ where $\mathfrak{B}$ has a lower Hypeorlogical power than $\mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 3.6

The 0^{th} Existence Level is equal to the 1^{st} Reality Level. For $n¿0$, the n^{th} Existence Level is the definitional-realm $\mathfrak{A}$ with the least THO-defined deflimit such that $\mathfrak{A}$ is MRL-reflecting, $\mathfrak{A}$ is defheavier than the n-1^{th} Existence Level, A contains all awareness within the awareness-set of the n-1^{th} Existence Level and $\mathfrak{A}$ contains some $\diamondsuit$inaccessible awareness that is not an element of the awareness-set of the n-1th Existence Level.

Object Definitions

1. $\mathfrak{Exi}(a)$ is defined as the least n such that n is a deflimit of the a^{th} Existence Level.
2. $\mathfrak{Exi}(\mathfrak{E}{\rightarrowtail}b)$ is defined as the least n such that n is the deflimit of all Existence Levels and n contains some $\diamondsuit$inaccessible awareness not found within the awareness set of $\mathfrak{Exi}(\mathfrak{E}{\rightarrowtail}b{-}1)$.
3. $\mathfrak{E}$xistencelock is defined as the least n large enough such that the $\diamondsuit$definition† of the awareness-set of n has a greater Hyperological power than all Existence Levels.

(Note: All objects collapsed by necessity)

4 Reflektion to Unitude

Informal Introduction into Basic Hyperology 1 v1.1.3

Goodels

July 2023

1 Abstract

Hyperology is a very new, quickly developing, entirely unique field of philosophy that aims to provide radically new ways of looking at certain philosophical problems. The purpose of Hyperology is to extend our ontology, what we can talk about, what is possible to reason about, and the fundamental limits of what is usually considered, to as far out as possible, while still doing so in a hopefully reasonable and intuitive way. The goal of doing this is to uncover a far broader, more powerful philosophical system which may further human knowledge in new and insightful ways. Hyperology is founded on specific, defined, objective ways of doing things, which will be detailed in later sections.

Hyperology essentially asks the question "are we currently going about metaphysical questions in a limited and oversimplified manner?", and then tries to generalise our methodology in terms of ontological scope and fundamental complexity to an extent far more radical than usually considered.
Hopefully in future, new and interesting applications of the framework of Hyperology will be found, there is exciting potential applications, perhaps there are many cases in many different fields in which Hyperology can unveil hidden complexity not yet observed.
However, the current state of Hyperology is underdeveloped and highly unexplored, due to obscurity of it. At the time of writing, it has only been around in its current form for a few months. There are currently only around under 5 individuals actively developing Hyperology, the purpose of this paper is to present new people to it in a hope of a community interested in seriously developing and expanding upon the field.

2 Introduction

This will serve as a somewhat informal introduction into the basic concepts of Hyperology. This is not meant to be a serious rigorous paper into Hyperology,

but a means to introduce more people into the field. There are some simplifications which have slight technical inaccuracies, but these are mainly trivial and such simplifications are important in order to efficiently teach Hyperology. This paper focuses on providing a more intuitive and informal understanding. It is highly important to read this paper all the way through, as many things said in earlier sections are greatly expanded on and justified in later sections.

3 Ontological Assumptions

There are certain ontological assumptions that we must at least suspend disbelief to assume when engaging within Hyperology. These do not have to be believed, but rather assumed for the purpose of Hyperology. Some of these assumptions may be heavily controversial and seem unreasonable, however, we will see later on within the paper that they are justified and important for certain things we will need to talk about within Hyperology. Regardless of the readers beliefs, within later parts of this paper we will see that at least assuming these ontological statements is vital to be able to talk about certain things in Hyperology.

Firstly, we must assume that certain mental conceptualisations that are not realised in a physical sense have some kind of existence - that is - we must assume a certain form of platonism in some way. This would mean that ideas such as 2, and even the conceptualisation of some physical object that is potential instead of realised, have some sense of existence as opposed to purely being mental constructs. This idea will have to be generalised further later on but for now will serve as an important axiom.

We must also assume that not only do possible conceptual objects exist in some way, but that *everything* that can exist in a conceptual manner exists (regardless of if the object is unthinkable within a human mind, or is paradoxical, or nonsensical), this does not imply the object must be true, just that it exists in some sense.
This means that contradictory objects can be said to exist, just that they exist as false (apart from in special cases which will be explained later on). This can be said to be some form of Meinongianism, however we will see later that this idea is *far* extended past any usual notion.
To reason about something (as in, simply to suppose an idea mentally) should be seen as to observe an object which exists in some sense.

Again, this does not mean we must take these objects to be true, simply that false objects can exist. Whether or not we take an object to be true in some sense is dictated by the logical system of reasoning in Hyperology, which is expanded upon in a later section.

Really, what we must do is find some maximally generalised conception of 'ob-

ject'. To do this, first take some classification, for example "red cars that exist", then generalise it, for example "red things that exist", then again "things that exist", then further "things", and so on, and we take 'object' to really mean the highest point on that sequence. We should see object less as a definable term, and more as a fundamental aspect. To define what an object is would automatically be limiting, as that definition itself is an object of sorts.
Instead, we should just accept object as a fundamental term, which is generalised as far as possible, such that no specific definable or undefinable point within the sequence of generalisations can be said to be sufficiently broad enough to be classified as 'object' in its fullest sense.
We can say that for the purposes of this paper, 'object' is a notion equivalently fundamental as the very existence of this paper itself, as in, the notion is generalised to an extent such that its very existence is not definable within this paper, but instead should be assumed to in a sense be fundamental in a strongly meta sense.

By sufficiently expanding our conception of what an object is, we can already see that it sorts out a lot of our ontological assumptions, it also means we can simplify certain issues. Nonsensical things exist in some sense, they are objects, it's just that they are false, nonexistent things still are objects and even have some more fundamental sense of existence evident in the fact we are at least reasoning about then in some way, and so on, we can see that object is a sufficiently general and fundamental notion to be able to accommodate for all things we could ever need to talk about within Hyperology.

4 The Scale of Totality

The concept of totality, maximality, The Absolute, and similar notions, have been a highly debated topic amongst philosophers and mathematicians. An important use of Hyperology is to explain some truly unrestricted notion of complete totality, which is vital for other concepts later on.
When talking about the concept of totality, we will be talking about some broadest possible class of *every* object, however such a collection is not as simple as it may seem.

Initially, many will equate this with the concept of infinity, a broad philosophical and mathematical idea. However, we can see set theoretical notions of the transfinite, which surpass typical ideas of the standard countable infinity. We can talk about collections of objects which are transfinite in size.
From here on, there are some reasonably basic set theoretical notions talked about, however such concepts are relatively easy to grasp with some research, and not *essential* for the broader scheme of this paper.

Proper classes (classes which are not sets - or in a *very informal* manner - collections too "massive" to be even transfinite sets) are a mathematical idea

usually equated as the reasonable limit of what can be thought of in terms of scope. It is a general assumption by many (but clearly, not all) mathematicians within this time period, that ultimately, every object can be reduced to some set, and therefore some proper class of all sets can be seen to be equivalent to the notion of genuine totality. This is also a common assumption within the world of analytic philosophy - that is - to speak of objects is to *actually* speak of sets.

However, concepts such that they do not exist within some proper class of all sets are not unheard of (aside from proper classes themselves), some foundational branches of mathematics talk of things which can classify over proper classes themselves.
Either way, under our ontological assumptions, it should be easy to expand our domain of discource to allow for objects which are fundamentally not reducible to sets in some nontrivial way. This is an idea clearly incompatible with many axiomatic systems of set theory such as ZFC, however since our scope is purposely above that of set theory, this is trivial. We are aiming to capture the truest essence of complete totality, and due to this some assumptions which may be unfavourable to some will have to be made purely for the purpose of talking of some broader scale of totality, which is important for many ideas within Hyperology.

In fact, under these ontological assumptions, our range of expression is vast. We can consider notions of collections of objects great enough such that they fundamentally *must* require some sense of para-consistent logic to be considered at all. Such objects would contain more objects than they contain - a contradiction violating the law of identity. Luckily, para-consistent systems of logic are also not unheard of and can talk about such ideas in reasonable ways, later on within this paper we will present a system of reasoning strong enough to easily encapsulate such ideas without principle of explosion. This logical system can be used to treat contradictoins in reasonable ways, which will be later explained.
The least of such a collection of objects too great to be identical to itself is known as $\mathbf{E}_0$

However, even notions such as $\mathbf{E}_0$ are *formalisable*. that is, can reasonably be equated to some object within some formal system. The Hyperological sense of formalisability is a far broader notion than what is usually meant. Formalisable objects are not simply those that must conform to some noncontradictorary formal system, but instead we are speaking of the concept of formalism in the most general sense. That is, formalisable objects are those such that they can sufficiently and meaningfully be classified and talked about with some abstract formal structure akin to that of a symbol game with fundamental strictly defined rules of manipulation. We have already breached the idea of complete consistency, nonsensical, paradoxical and seemingly unreasonable objects can still be considered formalisable.

Within our extremely maximalist ontological assumptions of Hyperology, we can *still* assume collections of objects somehow too vast to be formalisable, the least of such a type of collection is known as $\mathbf{F}_0$. Again, this may be greatly unfavourable within some philosophical views, however it shall be said again that we shall at least *play along* with such notions. It is important to note that unformalisable concepts can still be approached in a *rigorous* manner, it is just that their fundamental nature is too complex to be completely formalised. We can - and must - still retain objectivity, and clarity of meaning.
$\mathbf{F}_0$ is a vastly greater collection than $\mathbf{E}_0$. $\mathbf{F}_0$ itself must be unformalisable in some sense to truly classify over *all* formalisable objects.
However, can we really say that $\mathbf{F}_0$ contains all objects? $\mathbf{F}_0$ merely contains all formal objects, making it unformalisable by necessity, however we can speak of unformalisable objects and therefore some collection containing as elements $\mathbf{F}_0$ and say, 5 unformalisable objects, is simply greater than $\mathbf{F}_0$.

We can see a clear pattern in aprroaching totality, in which our specification of what is considered is slowly broken down. Firstly sets (more broadly, collections of objects that can be paired one to one with a set), then objects conforming to the law of identity, then formal objects in general. And there is no reason as to why further broader classifications cannot be made.
However, let us now talk about the collection of **all** objects, this should not be seen as some broad enough generalisation such that it is just *effectively* all objects to us as human thinkers, but the genuine idea of complete totality. Let us notate this idea of genuine absolute totality as $\mathbf{A}_0$.
$\mathbf{A}_0$ should be assumed to be above *any* arbitrarily strong generalisation, no matter how absurd going above such a generalisation might be. It is not simply bound by what can be conceivable, but should be taken to be the truest extent of everything.

Within this paper, we will talk about how Hyperology can be used to reasonably consider objects which are quite literally outside $\mathbf{A}_0$. Such concepts are known as *transmaximal*, and are simply, due to some very strange phenomena which are explained within the next section, genuinely outside the scope of 'everything', and due to this, classifications greater in magnitude than genuine totality can be talked about.

5 RL0 and RL1

Let us make an important separation between what we will call "Reality Level 0" and "Reality level 1".

Firstly, we shall expand more upon what we mean by 'abstract' within the context of Hyperology. We will split the term 'abstract' into 3 groups, type 1 abstraction, type 2 abstraction, and type 3 abstraction.
Type 1 abstraction is the typical notion assumed when talking about abstract

objects. Under this definition of abstraction, this classifies concepts which are nonphysical in their nature. For example the concept of 'magnitude' is abstract under this definition whereas 'book' is not.
Type 2 abstraction is a broader notion. It encompasses all objects which are not realised, in the sense that they exist conceptually rather than in an actualised manner within physical space in some sense. The conceptualisation (as in, the form it exists in when assumed mentally, generalised to be some actual form of existence independent of whether thought of or not) of an apple falls under this definition of abstraction, so do things such as 2, whereas the actual concrete realisation of the apple (ie. the apple existing physically rather than existing as an idea) does not. However, type 2 abstract objects that are potential-physical objects do not have to be perfect and generalised in the sense that Plato talked about. Say we have a specific book lying on the floor of some room, that specific book in that specific place has its own abstraction under the definition of type 2 abstraction.
Type 3 abstraction is an even broader notion, it contains at least everything within type 2 abstraction. We shall call type 3 abstraction 'Reality Level 0', or RL0 for short, and we will now discuss it in depth.

5.1 Collapse

Take some actualised, realised, concrete object, such an object would not be classified within type 2 abstraction. This may seem reasonable at first, however, we can see that upon thinking of some actualised, realised, concrete object, we are thinking of a conceptualisation which is in some sense non-realised. This can be thought of in the way that the conceptualisation of some object inherently strips it of some actualisation, that is that the true actualised and realised nature of the object cannot truly be captured without some reduction in its concreteness.
To put it simply, "the actualised, realised, concrete chair beside me" is in some sense still an abstraction of sorts, as upon thinking of it, it exists within our minds as some mere *conceptualisation* in the sense discussed previously. It is important to note that due to our assumptions, these conceptualised forms of certain objects do not have their existence dependent on being thought of, instead we assume these already exist as conceptual objects.

This highlights a phenomenon known as *collapse*. Collapse is essentially a relation between 2 forms. Collapse is the phenomenon highlighting the existence of some property of concreteness so actualised in its nature that it necessarily is in some sense incomprehensible, that any thought of some *genuine* concrete object is simply a collapse - that is, a conceptualisation in the sense that we have talked about. Usual philosophical notions of concrete objects seem to be identical even when collapsed - in other words, some collapsed form is an accurate description of them, meaning they are not actualised and concrete enough to have some collapse. However, if we are aiming for some true sense of concreteness, collapse may highlight that there is a strong enough notion of realisation and concrete-

ness such that its collapsed form is inaccurate - that is - there is some level of genuine actualisation such that it is fundamentally incomprehensible and automatically all references to it must be of some collapsed form of it. This should highlight later on the strong sense in which we mean RL0 and RL1, as collapse highlights how genuinely broad RL0 must be, even if we are not yet ready to discuss the complete nature of RL0 and RL1 until slightly later on within the paper. We can say that any collapsed object is within RL0, and any concept such that no collapse is required is also within RL0. Concepts such as 2 simply do not require any collapse, they fundamentally can exist naturally. Collapse seemingly only comes into play when our conceptions of concreteness expand so much that in some sense it is, for now, seemingly unthinkable.

This may seem simply avoidable by seeing the collapse of some concrete object as separate to its true form. However, we are simply just creating another layer of conceptualisation. We can talk about some separation between the collapsed object and its true realised form, but due to the nature of collapse, our conception of "its true realised form" is clearly also collapsed. This process of realising some separation between the collapse and its true form can be repeated indefinitely, however it only serves to create further layers of collapse.
This is empirically provable with a simple mental exercise. Take some obviously impossible concept, such as "this paper ceases to exist". Naturally, this already exists as some abstract object. Now, when we try to observe some un-collapsed form of this object, we see that it still must be collapsed due to it being unrealised and unactualised, this paper still exists after all. With this mental exercise, we also see that when observing this collapsed version of the concept from its true, realised, concrete form, this "true, realised, concrete form" must itself be collapsed as again, this paper still seems to exist.

This does not mean that previous conceptions of concreteness are somehow inaccurate in some way, it simply highlights that there must exist some notion of concreteness so strong that it far surpasses any previous conceptions. "An actualised, realised, concrete chair" still functions in the way it usually would philosophically, collapse simply implies stronger notions. When thinking of the chair, the mental version we are using (a version which can be said to be collapsed) is sufficient for seemingly all philosophy, excluding Hyperology itself.

It may seem as if talking about genuinely 'un-collapsed' non-RL0 concepts must be impossible to our fairly simplistic sub-omnipotent minds, as whenever we attempt to speak of some un-collapsed concept we are merely inherently speaking of it in a collapsed way, due to our minds inherently only being able to comprehend collapsed notions. To think of some un-collapsed concept would be to somehow in some sense "think it into existence", since collapsed concepts are able to capture all but the most profoundly-actualised notions of concepts.
However, we will set out to attempt to resolve this problem.

5.2 Capturing Uncollapsedness

Firstly we must recognise collapse. Essentially, by recognising collapse as a thing, we at least now have access to an important tool. Of course, it is not as simple as saying "the un-collapsed concept of x", as this itself is still subject to collapse, and therefore still exists in some sense, conceptually, and certainly exists within RL0. However, noticing collapse as a concept gives us the tool of collapse itself, which is important for being able to talk about methods of thinking of objects which surpass collapse.
However, we know that talking about "some concretely uncollapsed object" should also be collapsed. By talking about the object being outside of collapse, we are really capturing it within just another layer of thought (showing that we must be thinking about really just another layer of collapse). We will call this phenomenon "nested collapse".

To realise full uncollapsedness, we first must realise that no amount of nested collapse is representative of the full idea of full uncollapsedness. What we must do, is accept that we cannot use nested collapse to conceptualise of uncollapsedness, and then through this we can instead of trying to fully approximate the concept within our mind, accept that by necessity that some uncollapsedly concrete object would exist completely separate from our mind and by extension - any RL0 collapse. Instead, what we must do is create some collapse mentally, and instead of equating it to the uncollapsed notion, we assume it as in some sense a *placeholder*. Essentially, by making an absolute distinction between the version which exists mentally (which is by necessity a collapse), and the true uncollapsed version of some object which has some collapse, we are able to generate a far better picture of the true nature of the object.
It should be noted that by talking about our thought here, we are not saying that Hyperology is in any way dependent on our thought, but merely we are speaking of how *we* can accurately comprehend to some degree such concepts instead of severely limiting our understanding of them.
We are in a sense creating a layer of meta-thought (that is, sort of as we did when speaking of nested collapse). However, the difference is that instead of thinking about some collapse of our own thought, we must genuinely consider our own thought in the truest sense.

We should make sure this system is generalised past just our own human thought, and instead pose it as a more general and significant process of speaking of uncollapsedly concrete objects in such a way that cheats around significant reduction while keeping some aspect of comprehensibility by using some aspect of placeholder-ship. The nature of this system is highly strange and is currently under-studied. But for now, we can use this as a tool to more accurately interpret Hyperological concepts.

5.3 The Nature of RL0 and RL1

We can now accurately talk of RL0 and RL1. As said before, RL0 contains every collapsed form, and every object which requires no collapse. This is a staggeringly vast collection. A simple test can be preformed to see if some object is RL0 or not, all we must do is ask the question of if the object can exist within our mind without its fundamental nature being realised and concrete enough such that to picture it we must necessarily use the system described earlier. We can essentially take any object up to this point, say an apple, and we see that this comfortably exists within a conceptual way which does not necessarily force some aspect of meta-thinking, and therefore is within RL0. We can take the collapse of some genuinely Hyperologically concrete object, and in some sense, the meta-thinking which such a concept forces is not genuinely the form discussed, but instead is more akin to some pseudo-version such as nested thought collapse, in which the thinker merely pictures some version of themselves within their own thought rather than the genuine uncollapsed picture of their thought, and because of these even these such concepts are within RL0. Again it should be stated that Hyperological concepts are not centered on human thought, but more that we can observe our own thought surrounding Hyperological concepts to give stronger insight into their nature.

RL1 contains objects actualised and concrete enough such that they genuinely should 'bleed into reality' in some sense. RL1 has been hinted at before, essentially RL1 is a form in which objects are realised and concrete enough such that without some explicit method that we use within Hyperology, it would necessarily be collapsed upon conceptualisation. It is important that we see RL1 as an uncollapsed notion, rather than some collapsed aproximation as that would simply exist within RL0, and it is important that RL1 exists outside of RL0, and can be defined to be outside RL0 by stating that it must be uncollapsed. RL1 is a genuine conceptual leap entirely removed from the usual domain of discourse of the fundamental aspect of the nature of philosophy, it is as if the fundamental nature of all non-Hyperological philosophy is deeply rooted within RL0.

The conceptual shift from RL0 to RL1 is massive, we can picture all of human thought, every object, idea that will or will not be thought of, as simply having some place within RL0; after all, when conceptualising of such things they do exist comfortably within RL0, no Hyperological meta-thought is required to be able to speak of them.
A useful analogy goes like this: take the sentence 'the reader does not exist'. Of course, the reader still exists to have read this sentence. However, what if we speak of 'the reader genuinely does not exist, and this sentence is meant in an utterly realised way', but again, the reader still exists to have read that sentence, and therefore this must be collapsed, and therefore must be an RL0 notion. To imagine the RL1 form of this sentence, the reader must genuinely - all collapse and RL0 notions aside - picture as if by some work of black magic,

they (as in the genuine form of the reader who is consuming this paper, instead of some collapsed notion of the reader) never existed in some sense.
Picturing such a notion is very challenging to someone who is not yet used to the mental games that Hyperology forces upon us. However, it is an important mental exercise to try and comprehend such ideas, eventually it comes as natural. A lot of confusion has come from individuals misinterpreting Hyperological concepts by not genuinely capturing their true essence, and instead reducing their nature in some sense. For the example used above, the reader must in some sense, genuinely entangle their sense of self with Hyperology, and ensure that instead of thinking about some collapsed version of themselves, they are genuinely picturing the true self-existent form of themselves.

An interesting way to comprehend the idea of RL1 is to realise that this paper itself exists naturally in some RL1 sense. Of course, when we talk about this, we automatically are talking about some RL0 collapse of this paper. However, we can picture RL1 as being equivalent to the realness of the objects that exist around us in whatever room we are within, the aspect that means they somehow *exist*, not as hypothetical objects, or so-called "realised objects", but they have some status of *truly* being there (accounting for collapse as well, otherwise we are simply talking about RL0 notions).
If the reader is some skepticist when it comes to the existence of things outside the mind, or is within some similar vein, it is still a useful mental exercise to at least suspend those beliefs for the sake of the analogy.

Hopefully, we are now clear with the distinct natures of RL0 and RL1. RL0 and RL1 highlight an interesting aspect, known as $\mathfrak{form}$.

5.4 Form

$\mathfrak{form}$ highlights an important aspect of Hyperological objects which occurs when we start to consider things not within RL0. When considering an object, say an apple, we see we can talk about the notion of the apple "on RL0" or "on RL1", if the object seemingly stays the same at a basic level, it stays as a fruit which is usually red or yellow, what exact property is it that changes when considering some version "on RL1"?
This can mark the distinction between $\mathfrak{internality}$ and $\mathfrak{form}$. The $\mathfrak{internality}$ of an object is the nature of that object which is usually considered. The $\mathfrak{internality}$ of the apple contains properties such as "is named apple", "is a fruit", "is tasty", and it seems this stays exactly consistent regardless of whether on RL0 or RL1. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{form}$ is the aspect which changes between taking the apple on RL0 and taking it on RL1. $\mathfrak{form}$ can be seen as the fundamental nature in which an object exists - as in - *in what way it exists*. The $\mathfrak{form}$ of some object is a far trickier concept.

One analogy for $\mathfrak{form}$ is the distinction between words and fonts. We can have some word such as "square", and the actual word "square" and the meaning of

"square" remains consistent regardless of which font is used, this can be seen as an analogy for internality. The form is the "delivery" of the object, in some sense its format, within the analogy this would be the font of the word.
form shows the difference between "this sentence is blank", and " ".

However, these are very informal analogies, a slightly more accurate way to describe these terms is that internality is all the exact details of what some object is, it's properties, and form is the fundamental nature of in which way the object exists. form only really makes sense once we consider things which are outside of RL0, it's exact nature is quite strange, and will likely have some more accurate definition once Hyperology has advanced as a field. All objects naturally have distinct forms, it is just that we can consider identical internalities with differing forms. For example, the concept of apple naturally exists within RL0, there is no reason why it must exist within Rl1.
form is strictly a far more significant aspect than internality. If we have some internality of "the reader stops existing", this object is not significant until we have its form be RL1. form is very useful for showing us the scale of certain objects within Hyperology when consider things outside of RL0, as aspects of form start to become very significant and may genuinely effect the scale of some object. This may provide some justification for Transmaximality.

6 Transmaximality

6.1 The Form of Totality

It may be fruitful to consider the form and internality of $\mathbf{A}_0$. In doing so, we can find the contrast between objects within RL1 and objects within totality, and hopefully provide a legitimate argument for transmaximality.
The internality of $\mathbf{A}_0$ is relatively simple to figure out. We can see that the internality of $\mathbf{A}_0$ is simply "the collection of genuinely all objects". However, how do we go about finding the form of $\mathbf{A}_0$? Some may say that it is as simple as "some objects are on RL1, $\mathbf{A}_0$ contains all objects, therefore the form of $\mathbf{A}_0$ is on RL1". However, what if objects on RL1 are somehow too srtong in some sense to be quantified by "all"? To figure this out, we will have too look more into the relation between internality and form.

We can see that internality can pretty directly relate to form in the sense that statements within some objects internality about that objects form can define the form the object has. For example, if some object is defined as "some apple on RL1", the internality contains the statements "is apple" and "is on RL1", and therefore the internality *defines* the form to be RL1. One important thing to note is that collapse can complicate things here, for some collapsed object, it's internality may say that its form is RL1, whereas actually its form is on RL0. Because of this, we see that internality can only really define its form if we ensure that the object is uncollapsed.

This being said, if the internality makes absolutely no implications about the form, can we say that the form is automatically RL0 by default? Take some sufficiently large milestone, say, $\mathbf{E}_0$, let's consider the way in which $\mathbf{E}_0$ exists. Firstly, we see nothing inherently about the internality of $\mathbf{E}_0$ dictates a form which is not RL0. We also see that naturally $\mathbf{E}_0$ seems to exist within RL0, there's no inherent reason as to why a collection of more objects than it contains should be actualised and concrete enough such that we must play mind-games to even comprehend of the format in which it exists. We can pretty reasonably say that $\mathbf{E}_0$ naturally exists in RL0, after all its not as if every time we think of $\mathbf{E}_0$ we are having to picture it as something that *genuinely* uncollapsedly "happened", to do so would be unnecessary. It seems as if RL1 is a large enough conceptual shift such that it exists entirely outside normal methods of philosophising.
In fact, we can generalise this to all objects that don't necessarily imply some RL1 form using the same methods. The fact that they exist without necessarily being RL1 shows that without transposing them to RL1, they naturally exist within RL0. In a sense, RL1 requires some deliberate conceptual push to be talked about. Because of this, we can say that any object that does not necessarily imply an RL1 form could have already existed within RL0, and since RL0 trivially contains everything that can be RL0, we can say they exist within RL0. This only further highlights the extreme genuine conceptual leap RL1 is.

So, what about $\mathbf{A}_0$? We showed that if nothing within the internality of an object necessarily implies some non-RL0 form, we can say it already exists within RL0. But how do we know that "all objects" doesn't necessarily imply an RL1 form?
Firstly it's important to address the fact that the argument "the collection of all objects contains RL1 and so $\mathbf{A}_0$ must have an RL1 form and therefore can contain RL1 objects" is invalid as it uses circular reasoning. The justification of transmaximality is explicitly about RL1 objects *not* being contained within the collection of all objects - that they are beyond the concept of 'all' in some sense. Really what we are looking for is the answer to the question itself of the form of $\mathbf{A}_0$.
This being said, we can find that the form of $\mathbf{A}_0$ must be that of RL. We will start by showing that the internality of $\mathbf{A}_0$ does not imply anything of the form, which must imply that its form is RL0.

6.2 The Justification of Transmaximality

What does it mean to consider all objects? RL1 is a notion that in some sense exists beyond usual methods of conception, as stated before it seems we need a genuine paradigm shift in order to even access it as a concept, Notions such as "all concepts" do not imply this paradigm shift. We can use a slightly frivolous analogy to explain this further, consider your own fictional realm within your head, make sure you make a place for everything in this fictional realm. Within this fictional realm, we can make space for things such as apples, chalkboards,

people, $\mathbf{F}_0$, and whatever else we want to imagine, in fact this fictional realm has space for all objects. Within this analogy, we can say that the fictional realm is like how RL0 works. We know from the very fundamental properties of how RL1 works that it would be *inaccessible* to this mental realm in any form, we know that RL1 exists in such a way that conception of it works in a fundamentally different way. We can view RL1 as all the objects that exist outside readers own fictional realm, sure it may be able to contain every single object, but RL1 objects necessarily fundamentally transcend this notion. Of course this is just an analogy, really RL0 has absolutely nothing to do with thought or fiction or mental realms and exists naturally and independently, but this can analogously show the behaviour of how things in RL1 necessarily just transcend collections of all objects in a very helpful and easy to understand way. By implication of RL1 objects somehow necessarily being outside the scope of "everything", we can say that totality ($\mathbf{A}_0$) has the $\mathfrak{form}$ RL0.

Another way we can back up the $\mathfrak{form}$ of $\mathbf{A}_0$ being that of RL0 is performing an empirical mental exercise on the nature of $\mathbf{A}_0$. We can consider and philosophise about the nature of some collection of all objects without ever having to preform mind-games in the same way we must do with RL1 things. This backs up the position that $\mathbf{A}_0$ has a $\mathfrak{form}$ of RL0
All this hopefully gives extra context to the extreme paradigm shift that RL1 is, it is in a sense outside of non-Hyperological ways of philosophising entirely, existing as something which looms in the background, too far out of the picture to be observed. The usual non-Hyperological sense of philosophising about something is in strong contrast to RL1, which we can see exists entirely outside of the picture, existing not only outside the domain of discourse, but entirely inaccessible and unknowable within the conceptual domain itself.

It seems as if genuine uncollapsed RL1 objects are simply outside $\mathbf{A}_0$, they are transmaximal, genuinely outside of 'everything'. It is not as if $\mathbf{A}_0$ somehow failed to contain actually everything, it's that RL1 objects are just fundamentally beyond the notion of 'all'.
We can talk about transmaximally large collections of objects by considering some collection like $\mathbf{A}_0$ and one extra discrete object in RL1.

7 Further Extensions of Reality Levels

Since $\mathbf{A}_0$ is the 'limit' of RL0, encompassing of all of RL0, we will now jump ahead to $\mathbf{A}_1$. $\mathbf{A}_1$ is strong enough to where it is maximal even within the context of RL1, it can be seen as truly encompassing of RL1 and RL0.
Whereas $\mathbf{A}_0$ is the concept of maximality, $\mathbf{A}_1$ is strong enough to where it is too great to merely be a conceptualisation of maximality but a genuine RL1 actualisation of maximality. The true scale of $\mathbf{A}_1$ is near incomprehensible, not simply being merely beyond the genuine concept of the absolute, but far enough beyond to where it is a new kind of absolute.

However, this is Hyperology, and it is actually fruitful to consider things far deeper even beyond the scale of $\mathbf{A}_1$, repeating the same steps as we did with RL0 and RL1. We will define a new Reality Level, RL2. It may seem unnecessary to ever talk about things somehow past RL1, but it should be noted that an important part of Hyperology is to always look at what comes beyond. Almost always in doing so, some new interesting piece of theory is discovered. So, how do we extend Reality Levels further such that we even surpass RL1?
Informally we can say that RL2 is to RL1 as RL1 is to RL0, that RL2 is somehow actualised enough that in comparison, RL1 is merely potential/collapsed in the same way RL0 is. We take the conceptual leap between RL0 and RL1, and then apply this to RL1 to get RL2. However, a more precise way to talk about RL2 is that it is transmaximally actualised in some sense. RL1 exists in such a sense that its existence necessarily implies its uncollapsed actualisation, that is, to conceptualise of it, is to have it be genuinely uncollapsedly realised. RL2 would exist in such a way that to conceptualise *of* conceptualising of some RL2 object implies its uncollapsed actualisation.
This is similar to the "nested collapse" as spoken of before. However, nested collapse is specifically a concept related to our cognition, so to get something Hyperologically significant, we should first generalise the notion. Let's say that an RL-shift is a certain generalisation of nested collapse that transposes Reality Levels. RL1 RL-shifted down 1 equates to RL0, and RL2 RL-shifted down 1 equates to RL1. It is important to note that RL-shift is strictly a weaker notion than collapse, a collapse of RL2 is something that exists comfortably within RL0, collapse is a reduction that necessarily exclusively reduces to RL0.
An RL-shift down 1 can be said to take a *potential* version of some object. So if we had some RL1 object, and we RL-shifted it down 1, we'd end up with that object but existing in a state which is not absolutely uncollapsedly realised, which is an object within RL0. To potentialise an object in this sense is to instead of taking its uncollapsed realisation, to take a version which is not realised. RL2 objects are those such that when RL-shifted down by 1, they are RL1. This means that some RL2 object is so transmaximally-real, that even its conceptualisation, the form of it where we don't actually fully realise it, is itself RL1.

We can also do tests about the nature of RL2 by using mental exercises to find the way in which RL2 works mentally, and then to abstract some generalisations based off it, independent of just our mental conceptions.
We see that with RL1, we can't think of it directly, but we can at least think of thinking of it. Of course this would just be a collapse and it is not the Hyperological way to think of RL1. Really what we are saying is "it is at least possible to think of thinking of RL1". RL2 would be such that it is only possible to *think* of thinking of thinking of it. Hopefully from this we can get some sense of intuition about the nature of RL2. RL1 is genuinely out of the picture in some sense, RL2 is so outside the picture that even us saying so is completely inadequate of how much of a conceptual leap it is. RL2 things are in a way *post-real*,

in the sense that they are realer than real in the way that transmaximal things are greater than maximal.

Even though the concept of RL2 is quite hard to grasp due to being outside the realm of any type of usual thought, we can still continue the steps we took from RL0 to RL1 to RL2 indefinetely, and get any level of RLn, we can even reason about things such as RL$\mathbf{A}_0$, which would be the maximal level of RL, we can even get RL past the last RL by using transmaximal inputs.
And, of course, each of these Reality Levels has its own maximality equivielnt, we can continue on with any level of $\mathbf{A}_n$, and there is no reason to where we cannot consider something such as $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{A}_0}$. The object strong enough such that it is maximal in the context of all Reality Levels is known as $\textcircled{\mathbf{A}}$

8 The Reasoning of Hyperology

This brings us to a new important section, the logic and reasoning of Hyperology is a far more complex topic. When doing Hyperology, what logic and reasoning are we using? What do we use when considering the validity of transmaximality for example?
The logic of Hyperology is known as $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$. We can see that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ is not simply something like classical logic, as we can see classical logic is merely something within RL0, RL0 being something surpassable within Hyperology and therefore it at the very least cannot reason about RL1 or higher. We also can see that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ can't merely be something within RL0 at all, since it can reason about things such as RL1 and higher.
Instead, $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ should be seen as the intuitive metaphysical logic of reasoning about Hyperology as a whole. In some way, $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ will always be too complex and intricate for us to ever truly approach (every time there is some new conceptual jump, there must be some new aspect of logical reasoning to account for it), so instead we work by iteratively approximating $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$.
We can start by finding general principles of $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ that are almost certainly right, then through gradual refinement, we can slowly build up our knowledge of the reasoning of $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$. Grander principles of $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ are almost impossible to figure out, these would have to be broad enough to encompass the reasoning for any new kind of trickery we'd ever make. Because of this, $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ is approximated from smaller picture details, the broader picture being far too complex to truly capture in broad general observations.

Essentially, $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ is the 'metaphysically-accurate' way (in the sense of not being arbitrarily random or nonsensical) of expanding a system of Hyperological reasoning while retaining reasonable intuitive structure. While too complex and nuanced to ever truly be fully captured, we can approximate it from the lower scale, building off principles we already understand from $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ already. To a formalist this may sound nonsensical, however we must consider that for example systems of axiomatic set theory having some goal in mind, after all, why choose

those specific axioms? Whether or not this natural reasoning is something which platonically exists or not is up to belief, but we can at the very least see that there is some metaphysical significance and weight towards some specific system of reasoning, and it seems that mathematical and philosophical systems of axioms are often attempts of approximating such a system.

An important and interesting note is that $\mathfrak{u}^*$ is fundamentally unformalisable in some way. This does not mean the practice of Hyperology is in any way not rigorous or subjective in its logic, $\mathfrak{u}^*$ is a singular objective system of reasoning. Some aspects of the approximation of $\mathfrak{u}^*$ are 'intuition' based in the sense that they are too complex to be encompassed by a formal system, the metaphysical picture of $\mathfrak{u}^*$ is far too complex and vast to be simply a formal system of reasoning (we can see this in issues as basic as those as $\mathfrak{u}^*$ being able to reason about things such as $\mathbf{F}_0$). This can be thought of as the same way it is for example mostly understood what is and what is not a chair. Trying to define strict formal parameters to determine exactly what is and what is not a chair would be extremely unproductive, however we see that there is a mutually understood intuitive view of what falls under the construct of chair and what does not (this analogy is imperfect, but should get the point across). Cases of inaccuracies may occur, for example within the chair analogy you may have cases where some believe it to be a chair and others do not, in this case, we just have to realise the inaccuracy and correct it by refining our approximation of $\mathfrak{u}^*$ further. Because of this, $\mathfrak{u}^*$ can be approximated in a rigorous way, we can iterate our preciseness to be as rigorous as we could need.

Through this methodology, this reasoning is extremely powerful and can be used to talk about many things that simply would not be able to be talked about in a reasonable and logical manner otherwise. The approximation of $\mathfrak{u}^*$ can done in a rigorous manner by simply just making further refinements to our approximation.

8.1 u*-shifting

$\mathfrak{u}^*$-shifting is a natural phenomenon that comes to light when studying some of the specific properties of $\mathfrak{u}^*$. It is essentially the answer to the question of how we can reason about $\mathbf{E}_0$ without something akin to the principle of explosion occurring.
$\mathfrak{u}^*$-shifting is essentially the act of ontologically shifting down in importance some logical statements. $\mathfrak{u}^*$-shifting makes some logical statements "only locally true", and some "globally true". What we mean by this is that objects which are false according to $\mathfrak{u}^*$ do not have their status of existing removed entirely, instead they are just seen as having some inferior existence akin to Meinongianism, and merely only having some truth value when purely considering some more local area such as within some other system of reasoning.
Due to this, $\mathfrak{u}^*$ has the ability to reason about logical systems themselves, it can $\mathfrak{u}^*$-shift them if contradictory to $\mathfrak{u}^*$, such we see that they are true under

their own assumptions, just that this truth is inferior compared to global truth within $\mathfrak{U}^*$.

The individual assumptions of some object is called an $\mathfrak{i}^*$, and we notate the $\mathfrak{i}^*$ of some object O as $\mathfrak{i}^*(\mathrm{O})$. Let's examine something such as $\mathfrak{i}^*(\mathbf{E}_0)$, we can see this contains the statement "is greater than itself", but is this necessarily $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifted? It seems that $\mathfrak{i}^*(\mathbf{E}_0)$ is directly self contradicting, however it seems the way that $\mathfrak{U}^*$ can deal with this is to $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shift down specific parts of $\mathfrak{i}^*(\mathbf{E}_0)$ which would contradict $\mathfrak{U}^*$, and in doing so we can preserve $\mathbf{E}_0$ as a meaningful object. We can say that $\mathbf{E}_0$ contains more objects than it contains, it is just that we reject any contradictory reasoning that follows. In doing so, we can often talk about very strange objects and preserve their essence, without having to destroy our entire logical system, $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifting acts almost as a safety net in some sorts. Within Hyperology, objects which are contradictory sometimes are simply true, it is just that we are able to ensure that we remove any absurdity which may take place. Contradictory $\mathfrak{i}^*$ (that is, $\mathfrak{i}^*$ which hold internal contradictions) are known as locally inconsistent, whereas things which contradict $\mathfrak{U}^*$ are known as globally inconsistent. locally inconsistent things can exist without being $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifted, but globally inconsistent things are $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifted.
Because of this, it may seem as if proof by contradiction does not work, after all if we can hold some contradictions as true then surely proof by contradiction becomes meaningless. However this is specifically not the case due again to $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifting. Say we have some statement P1 we are willing to disprove, and some statement P2, if we know P2 is absolutely true, and we show that P2 contradicts P1, we can show this to be valid proof that P1 is false (technically, $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifted). This is because if we know P2 to be true in $\mathfrak{U}^*$, and P1 contradicts that, then P1 is necessarily globally contradictory and therefore definitely $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifted, it is *only* local contradictions which are permitted.

$\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifting is not something we necessarily defined into $\mathfrak{U}^*$, it's just that $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifting is just one naturally existing (and clearly, due to the nature of $\mathfrak{U}^*$, likely greatly simplified) aspect of $\mathfrak{U}^*$ that we can observe.

8.2 o*

Within Hyperology, o* are very interesting concepts which have already been found to have many fruitful benefits, most of which are beyond the scope of this paper.
o* are essentially where we consider Hyperology under some alternate system of reasoning other than $\mathfrak{U}^*$, due to the very nature of this, all o* are necessarily $\mathfrak{U}^*$-shifted and are strictly only true within that o* itself. o* are in fact special types of $\mathfrak{i}^*$, specifically they are types of $\mathfrak{i}^*$ which aim to consider the entirety of Hyperology under some alternate system of reasoning, instead of some specific area of discourse. It's important to note that o* are not meant to be serious ways of going about Hyperology, rather they just allow for us to show the behaviour of other assumptions and systems of reasoning temporarily, as we must

automatically assume $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ when doing Hyperology, regardless of personal beliefs.

An example of some o^* could be the o^* where we view all Hyperology as collapsed, we can call this Hyperological Collapsism, or HGC, and we notate this as $o^*(HGC)$, within $o^*(HGC)$ we can say that every Hyperological object is within RL0.
$\rightsquigarrow$ is an interesting symbol that can be used to show how different objects behave in different o^*. For some o^*, $o^*(L)$, and some object A, $A \rightsquigarrow o^*(L)$ is the object that when considered within the global truth $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$, behaves the same as A does when considered in $o^*(L)$. For example if we consider $\mathbf{F}_0 \rightsquigarrow o^*(HGC)$, we see this just equates to $\mathbf{F}_0$, since $\mathbf{F}_0$ behaves in the same way it behaves under $o^*(HGC)$, it is not altered by the assumption that all Hyperology is collapsed.

9 THO

This brings us to the broader picture of the foundations of Hyperology. **THO** is the foundational aspect of Hyperology as a whole.
THO is important as it exists beyond Hyperology, acting as the axioms and foundational principles of Hyperology, and again like $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ it must be slowly refined. $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ exists as one aspect within **THO**. The purpose and intent of **THO** is to provide a reaosonable, meaningful, somewhat rigorous approach, and most impotrantly, objectivity, to Hyperology. Firstly, an important principle within **THO** is the principle of unformalisability, this expands further upon the inability of Hyperology to accurately be captured by exact formal rules as discussed earlier. We say that on top of this, the *reduction* of Hyperology to exact formal parameters is not a meaningful reduction in the sense that it does not preserve the intended meaning. We may be able to find a reduction of all current Hyperology, but as stated earlier, we should not see any current state of Hyperology as the true completed state but rather an approximation. Due to this, we should assume that while the current approximation may have a (if not, unfeasible in practice, likely requiring advanced simulations of brain activity) reduction, the true completed state of Hyperology does not. Reductions of the current approximation of Hyperology are called HRFs (Hyperological Reductive Formalisms), and an important principle is that HRFs should not be seen as meaningful reductions of Hyperology.
Another important aspect which somewhat relates to HRFs is that the mental conception of Hyperological object should not be seen as equivalent to the Hyperological object itself. Even if we can use cheats within our mental conception to assure that we can speak of uncollapsed objects, it is important to assume Hyperology as something that exists independent of our minds. In fact, part of the adequate way to understand and interpret some uncollapsed Hyperological object is to ensure the understanding that it exists strongly independently of our minds. Properties of RL1 objects can not exist otherwise.
Another important aspect of **THO** is $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$, which gives us a logical system of reasoning in Hyperology.

It is also important to note that **THO**, like $\mathfrak{U}^*$, is always incomplete, and too complex to ever be truly captured, instead we must continuously refine it. New axioms are often added to **THO** as it is being refined, and pre-existing axioms are also given added depth.

There are 2 important aspects to the nature of **THO**, which are **THO**-Authority and **THO**-Collapse.
Firstly, **THO**-Authority is the aspect of **THO** which gives it control over the reasoning and functioning of Hyperology, this means that we cannot use Hyperological cheats to affect the axioms of THO itself, which could cause massive contradictions. Later on in Hyperology we conceive of Hyperological concepts that are meta about Hyperology itself. Due to this, **THO**-Authority is the principle which stops any Hyperology concept from re-defining some aspect of **THO**, essentially it creates a separation between **THO** and Hyperology. This ensures the principles of **THO** are not Hyperologically transcended.
We will get into **THO**-expansionin the next section.

There are some more advanced **THO** principles, but these are beyond the scope of this introductory paper.

10 Hyperologically-Meta Objects

Now, think back to $\mathbf{A}_n$, imagine if we kept going past the notion of Reality Levels, and started to define even stronger concepts. Such things of that level do exist, but they will be skipped over in this paper so that we can get to the next important milestone above them.
Imagine if the development of Hyperology kept going indefinitely, what would be the limit of the completed state of Hyperology? Let us define a Hyperological concept as 'The limit of the completed state of Hyperology'. We will give this the symbol $\mathfrak{a}^+$, this essentially hopes to be some collection of all Hyperology in general.

At first the concept of $\mathfrak{a}^+$ may seem either invalid, or as there could be no Hyperology past it, however this is not the case due to **THO**-Collapse.
We can see that a Hyperological definition cannot have **THO**-Authority - that is - it cannot redefine the framework of **THO**. **THO**-expansionis an aspect of **THO** and therefore $\mathfrak{a}^+$ must necessarily be subject to **THO**-Collapse, due to it being a Hyperological concept.
Essentially all **THO**-expansiondoes, is it says that for any given Hyperologism, Hyperology can exist past it. To say an object is **THO**-expanded is to say that Hyperology has expanded such that it can genuinely surpass it, it is not a reduction in the same way that regular collapse is.
Of course, the $\mathfrak{internality}$ of $\mathfrak{a}^+$ initially makes it seem hard to surpass, however if we start to consider the $\mathfrak{form}$ of $\mathfrak{a}^+$ then we can start to consider ideas strong enough such that their $\mathfrak{form}$ fundamentally surpasses the notion of $\mathfrak{a}^+$,

very similar to the justification of transmaximality. We can in a sense consider something which is a "next RL1 past $\mathfrak{a}^+$". When something surpasses an object due to its $\mathfrak{form}$ fundamentally conceptually surpassing it, we call it a surpassion by $\mathfrak{form}$, and when something surpasses something else through its $\mathfrak{iternality}$, we call it a surpassion by $\mathfrak{internality}$. Like $\mathbf{A}_0$, we cannot just surpass $\mathfrak{a}^+$ by $\mathfrak{iternality}$, we must use a surpassion by $\mathfrak{form}$, something that would genuinely be a paradigm shift above philosophising about "the limit of the completed state of Hyperology".

So, $\mathfrak{a}^+$ is not genuinely the biggest Hyperologism we could actually possibly define, since its claim of being the limit of the completed state of Hyperology is **THO**-expanded, meaning that there are some Hyperological concepts powerful enough to still somehow transcend $\mathfrak{a}^+$. However, this doesn't make $\mathfrak{a}^+$ and invalid notion.
THO-expansionmeans that we shift up our conception of how powerful Hyperology really is, rather than lessening the object in some way. We view $\mathfrak{a}^+$ as the largest Hyperological object, it's just that we view **THO** to be powerful enough such that there exists Hyperological concepts that are tricky and meta enough to surpass $\mathfrak{a}^+$, this slightly relates back to ideas of transmaximality. Due to principle of discollapse, we don't view **THO**-expansionas weaker, instead we view **THO** as stronger.

Things past $\mathfrak{a}^+$ are outside the scope of this paper, but hopefully the reader can get some kind of intuition behind something that would almost analogously be to $\mathfrak{a}^+$ as RL1 is to $\mathbf{A}_0$, even though any further is beyond the scope of this paper, ideas about $\mathfrak{form}$ hopefully give some general intuition of what such an object would be like.

11 Conclusion

This is merely the absolute baseline of Hyperology, we have not even scratched the very surface in what there is to explore with Hyperology. The world of Hyperology is fascinating and rich, and is within its infancy. More efforts into the development of Hyperology must be in place, there is a vast landscape left currently unexplored. The true potential for Hyperology, and how it can hopefully be applied in future, is currently mostly unknown.
It is recommended that the reader reads this paper at least twice.

⚠RL58 Chickeb ⚠

Hyperology

Note: I'll use a star (*) whenever I wish to emphasise a nonstandard/specifically defined usage of a term if I feel there could be confusion.

Baseline Worldview Assumptions

Ontological Groundlessness

The fundamental position I'll be taking is what I term as *ontological groundlessness*, this serves as the absolute foundation for everything in this document. I don't want to argue for its case here, it could be talked about for all eternity. I view this position as so absolutely fundamental that in its rawest form it is truly ineffable, a ground-level concept which unfurls endlessly, we can hold it more basically and simplistically as a useful philosophically assumption, though. I'll be getting at a more approachable, practical explanation for ease of communication.
Ontological groundlessness should be seen less as a metaphysical assertion and more the complete lack of metaphysical assertions. It's the view of the always bottomless nature of existence, the absence of any ultimate solidity, ontological tops, bottoms, the objective, subjective, it's the belief in the always in-betweenness and the inherent limitation of any picture, the alway-incomplete-full-picture.

We can think of ontological groundlessness by splitting it up into 3 main principles:

- **Non-absoluteness**
  The lack of absoluteness. This includes the rejection of objectivity and of subjectivity, this is the acceptance of the complex in-betweenness, layeredness, and the back and forth conversations of reality. We can view reality as something fluid, through never complete metaphysical systems, poetry, the phenomenological, mythology, unfurling spirals, and the intertwinedness of all things. The lack of singular thing-ness. The lack of any complete essence. I will take note of what I'll call *intergrounding*, with lack of an ultimate basis (internal or external), things must ground each other through mutual relationalism and context, this is what I'm getting at with the idea of reality being conversational, this is intertwinedness.
- **Limitlessness**
  When taking non-absoluteness, we can find within it the specific form of it that I will call *limitlessness*. This extends non-absoluteness to any complete picture, the rejection of a true ontological bottom, or any true ultimate ontological top, there

will always be a more, or a deeper level. The final trapdoor paradoxically opens up into further descent. The sky is without a ceiling.

- **Relationalism**
  Relationalism emphasises the conversational nature of reality, the way in which things reflect and mutually ground each other (I'll call this intergrounding), without ultimate ground all things must lean on and reflect within each other. We can see this in the reflection of the moon in a puddle of water or The World phenomenologising itself through sentient beings. The unspeakably complex interactions and folding-inness we can find. interconnection and symbols.

The goal of this is not to make a cliched point about the unity of all things - this is also an absolute and a limited view. Instead the goal is to accept the inherent theoretical limitations of any one view. This serves as the soil I will grow my ideas from. These ideas are deeply influenced by the Buddhist concept of emptiness (sunyata), and adjacent ideas within western philosophy.

Informality

I will heavily be utilising informality, perhaps phrased better as *non-formality*, which I believe is an essential and deeply powerful aspect of communication, separating itself from formal symbol games. The power of informality lies in its vagueness, the non-literalness, that which comes from the unconscious and the unspoken relation between words and the bed of wordless experience accumulated through being a sentient being within the world. I will not be going in depth into the philosophy of language and all the rabbit holes that opens up.
The power of non-formal communication lies in the rich depth able to be conveyed in the space beneath the words, the fuzziness is the point. Through this we can get at - point to - things which can't be gotten at directly, the unspoken and perhaps ineffable relation within meaning. We can see this in its most extreme form within art and poetry, however that kind of deep subjectivity won't be so helpful in a more structured philosophical context so instead I'll try to find a balance between clarity and structure, and deeper non-formality.

General Existential View

It's not overly relevant but maybe for context I wanted to add that I generally view the full scope of reality as something rooted within impermanence and some form of very vague materiality - that is to say - although I have a very maximal ontology, due to non-absoluteness and principles of interconnectedness (which can also be interpreted as *cohesion* in a sense) I do not believe that reality generally consists of alien conceptual sludge, or abstract white noise.

Foundations

Reflection

Reflection is something found within intertwinedness, it's an intentionally fuzzy concept. It primarily concerns two things and the relation between them, but not just any form of relation, specifically the form of one thing being captured within another, not just a coincidental mirroring, but a specific shadow cast from one point into another. This can form intergrounding, things existing in reference to the shadow they cast within other things. Reflections can also exist as imperfect forms, perhaps *simulations*, or structural repetition, or recontextualisation, etc. The ways in which things can be reflected is endless and opens up unimaginable nuances.

We can see reflection within language, capturing meaning within the form of words, or within sentient experience in which externality is reflected inwards through the senses and perhaps other complexities of experience. We can also see reflection in the classic example used above of the moon reflected in the water.

Since reflection is so general (and perhaps can be found in all cases in *some* sense), it's more useful to classify specific kinds of reflection which build upon this conceptual framework; this will be explored more later.

Immediacy

Immediacy concerns *relational closeness*. If we look at the ways in which things relate to and ground each other, immediacy has to do with the strength of grounding, the ways in which things fall into hierarchies of distance and the close-upness.

We might usually find the strongest, *closest* form of grounding to be self-grounding, the truth of a thing defined by itself. However, it's important to deconstruct what is meant by *self*, I don't wish to pose things as individual and captured within neat boundaries, this goes against the philosophical foundations of groundlessness. Instead, we can use immediacy to examine the blurred boundaries of identity (in a general sense, not just in terms of beings) and so reveal the fuzzy, layered nuance of the truth of a thing.

Self-grounding often has ontological weight over grounding from the outside, more distant forms of grounding, this is an example of the hierarchy of immediacy. In this

sense, immediacy can be seen as (metaphorically) about family, the heightened metaphysical relevance of *locality*. This is, again, a fuzzy concept which can be endlessly opened up.

Mundanity, Ontological Introspection, and Extrospection

Ontological introspection, versus ontological extrospection, has to do directly with both immediacy and a metaphilosophical view of what it means for us to *philosophise* within the world about the world.

Mundane real life (**MRL**) is the everyday world that we live, breathe, eat, walk, and philosophise within, it holds direct significance to us through its *immediacy* and in this sense holds immense ontological strength relative to us. **MRL** is the family which contains the kind of beings which may read this document, the ones around them, and the places we live, it contains pens and paper and books but also sandwiches, clouds, etc. **MRL** is full of potential for rich analysis, but I'll leave it here for now.

Ontological extrospection concerns usual philosophising, the examination from a standard inside-looking-out position of the world and its structure generally, the first layer of an analysis of being. However, in itself it's incomplete, we are limited by the structure of our philosophising in itself.

Ontological introspection aims to know itself, it's the metaphilosophical analysis of ourselves and our conceptualising within **MRL**, it seeks to get at the important weight of the immediacy of self-reflection. Some forms of phenomenological and existential philosophy can be examples of introspection in this way.

Together, introspection and extrospection can form more of a full picture, if we examine both we see the ways in which they nest within each other, and the lines begin to blur. Through extrospective philosophy we can seek to get at an encompassing view of things, and through introspective philosophy we can examine our methodology, the limits of our language and thought, the very immediate form that all of our philosophy *exists within* on a meta level, they are both incomplete without each other.

Layering

Layering is the nesting of paradigms, perspectives within perspectives, it's slightly more abstract than the things above. Layering is the way in which things nest within each other in terms of conceptual dialogue, especially (but not exclusively) when it comes to forms of contradiction or perhaps indefinite conversation.

A simple layering is just one thing understood within another (not just as a point of reference or context but more strictly within the *eye of the thing*, its paradigm) through reflection, an eye seeing another eye. However often we can find a recursive, indefinite back and forth, eyes looking back at each other, or mirrors positioned to face each other. This exact phenomenon can be found in the pattern of philosophical introspection and extrospection explained above. Extrospection can be viewed within the paradigm of

introspection, and from there we can perform another paradigm leap by encompassing this in our now more ontologically heavy extrospection, and so on. The analogy of mirrors facing each other is really helpful here as it demonstrates not only the recursiveness, but the more fundamental ("bigger") mirrors with each recursion. This style of layering I will call *recursive layering*. There can also be recursive layering of a thing within itself, an eye staring at itself, I'll call this *self-recursive layering*.
It's important to note that layering doesn't necessarily follow a thesis, antithesis, synthesis format, the nature of layering is often far more complex and hard to deconstruct in full. A core part of layering is often the revealing of deeper foundations, in the meta rug pull sense of introspection and extrospection, or in the more simplistic sense of general theoretical deepening. This concept of paradigm (or viewpoint/system/perspective/theory) that I have expanded upon in the last few sections will also be important.

Milestones

Milestones are a bit of a shift in tone from the previous concepts. They have to do with quantifying the scale of existence, they are a way of modelling large paradigms of the totality of existence. It's directly related to the concept of limitlessness, if there *is* no limit, then milestones function as increasingly large simulations of attempts at limits. Of course, with each milestone comes the inherent hole at its centre, each one inevitably collapses revealing something still deeper, broader in scope. In fact this is their entire point.
Milestones function in terms of depth and width, those two are inherently related. Each is based on its own relative paradigm of ontology, its fundamental view of being, and through that, the scope of things it can quantify.
The purpose of milestones is a kind of extreme extrospective philosophising that allows us to indefinitely refine our ontology, through the exploration of milestones we can endlessly deepen our theories in terms of their sheer scope, a zooming-out. Beneath the philosophy, this is a very primal urge similar to looking up at the sky at night. "But *what's beneath that?"*
In terms of the implication of the existence of nonexistent things, we don't really have to worry about that too much, we can very simply take a position generally aligned with but separate from noneism. Going off everything discussed up to this point, realness, unrealness, existence and nonexistence are not neat, simple, absolute categories or boxes to be checked, each thing holds its own unique sense of existence relative to that around it. The monster under the bed exists relationally to the imagination of a child, but *exists as* an irrational fear, which can be perceived by the parents, this avoids limited objectivity and nihilistic subjectivity. We don't need to use the reification of formal truth values. A milestone retains a clear, unwarped picture of the actual contents of things, even if limited in depth.

Everything and Beyond

Everything

When trying to get a feel for the scope of existence, the concept of large cardinals within the field of set theory in mathematics comes to mind. Not that it's overly relevant, it's a very complex, technical, and unrelated subject - *but* - the extending of infinity into yet larger forms of infinity, to the point of things so large that to even get a vague conceptual model of the structure of it is absolutely out of the picture is definitely within the spirit of trying to get at whatever the scope of *absolutely everything* is, especially when it's common for philosophers to default to a base idea of "infinity" when it comes to understanding everything (obviously we have to translate things around analogously when comparing these very different forms of infinity).

Milestones are very very relevant here, the endless unfolding of milestones is what we're really doing when we try to get at absolutely everything, that is, the true scope of existence. An obvious problem arises though, if we take existence to be absolutely limitless, then what does it mean to accept an "absolutely everything"? Let's entertain the notion of everything for now, the final milestone, the milestone that without fail quantifies over all things regardless of any conceptual quirk, we'll call it **A**, we'll see if we can make it work. Some of examples of milestones that exist within/are lesser than **A** are milestones so big they contain themselves, milestones so big they are larger than themselves, milestones so big that they cannot be structurally embedded into formal mathematics practically or theoretically, and milestones so big that no person could ever theoretically define them (apart from, i guess, in the detached way in which i just pointed to such a thing), keep in mind complexity and relational existence when it comes to such things.

Firstly, the paradoxical nature of such a thing is not at all an issue, paradoxical milestones that exist as self containing and are formed in contradictions exist well before **A**. We do hit a legitimate wall when we try to figure out what we actually mean by *all* though, we end up with circular definitions, without actually getting to whatever the core of everything means, everything is all things, but what does "all things" mean? We can zoom out a bit and take a look at the overall progression of milestones, the endless deepening of ontology, it's clear we won't be able to find an ending to this game from within it, we'll have to make a paradigm shift.

We can make a conceptual leap and look at our methodology of philosophising as a whole, moving into introspection, through this we have the upper hand over the bigger picture. Our attempt at getting at a true *everything* existed within the scope of us philosophing, and within language and communication. Every attempt ultimately fails due to the inherent limitation of this way of philosophising.
Instead, we can embrace the ineffable leap, instead of trying to grasp at **A** directly, we can step outside of the game entirely, and realise its position on the deeper level. Instead of adding words to the paper, we have to look at the paper itself. In this view of everything, the true totality of existence is something entirely out of pure conceptualising, it simply cannot be gotten at on the base level of philosophising, it requires us to take the paradigm leap upwards and find the empty space within our language, and to let it speak for itself, the unspoken ground beneath it.
This paradigm shift within our own philosophy is a direct reflection of the broader ontological paradigm shift between the contents of existence and **A** itself, this idea of our own metaphilosophy structurally reflecting extrospective ontology will remain crucial. **A** can't be a standard milestone, it has to be a different class of thing entirely in order to truly quantify over the whole picture, unique in its form. Perhaps the word "thing" starts to lose its meaning at this level, something that transcends the entire idea of things existing - existence - in any sense. Deeper than fundamental ontology itself, maybe. Yes, I'm leaving this intentionally very vague for now as I'll get into it way deeper in a bit.

It's important to note how absolutely transcendent **A** is, it's very easy to understate in an informal document for brevity, but **A** is absolutely unimaginable as a concept - or - it's not really a concept at all, its communication in itself requires a meta leap of deconstruction behind philosophising as a concept in itself, it's empty space behind words, the ungraspable ultimate bottomlessness beneath existence itself. Analogously, if existence itself (and I mean that in the most general way possible) is a videogame on a console, **A** is *the hardware itself*. The purely intuitive wordless leap that goes into conceptualising **A** is in itself deeply strange, that kind of conveyal of complete wordlessness *within words* points towards something crucial which I will also go into deeper as the document goes on.

But still, a problem remains, how do we reconcile **A**, a supposed absolute limit, with limitlessness? If there's something *more* somehow, is it truly more than *everything*? Does limitlessness extend even to that? Or was **A** never really everything in the first place? Or does this differentiation even exist in the first place? These questions are very crucial and define the concept of *transabsolutism*.

Introducing Transabsolutism

I now have to deconstruct this idea of **A** all together, I've gotten at it in an overly simplified way to introduce the concept. **A**, like everything, is ultimately complex and groundless. Despite its transcendence, even **A** itself exists in a complicated, blurry, and interdependent form. It's reflected right here and right now within these words, being mirrored and recontextualised, and that itself is paradoxical mutual grounding. If we fall into an overly linear mindset we end up missing the entire point.

The paradigm shift of applying groundlessness to even **A** can be hard to swallow, but **A** only exists within the context of ontological groundlessness and by posing any kind of concrete ground onto **A** we'd ironically be retroactively stripping the transcendence of it by dismantling the ontology it embodies. The line between making toast in the morning and **A** is blurry, and both are intertwined. Of course, this opens up some weird form of self-containment, we can view this as a kind of layering as mentioned before. Self-entanglement.

The way in which **A** exists also becomes strange, existence isn't made up of black and white abstract categories, milestones don't exist as formless towering separate essences, we have to hold **A** in the context of the layeredness and non-absoluteness of existence. In a sense, even **A** is caught up in materiality, impermanence, and impurity. **A** is also ultimately formless and essenceless, it does not serve as a root or ground.

The most important point really though, and I've been putting it off, but **A** does not exist in contradiction with limitlessness. There is another, deeper paradigm shift, in which we must both acknowledge that **A** truly *is* completely transcendent and ultimate, and yet at the same time, things keep falling *even deeper than* complete transcendence, at the seeming surpassing of limitlessness we open the door to an even deeper, more foundational forms of limitlessness. There is an end but there is a post-end which continues to waterfall down with no bottom, and what seem to be absolute conclusions such as **A** only strengthen our understanding of groundlessness in the same way pre-**A** milestones (and perhaps with our deeper knowledge, we can extend the definition of milestones to encompass **A**) strengthen our understanding of the true scope of things. This is the spirit of *transabsolutism*.

The act of philosophising, ontological extrospection, concerns things that exist, or, existence *itself* (or, "the question of being" according to Heidegger). When it comes to true fundamental ontology, we can model approximations through milestones, but as we know it seems the study of existence in terms of extrospective ontology is inherently an incomplete means of doing so, **A** always exists outside of the frame of being entirely. We had to make a fundamental paradigm shift, *beneath* the writing of existence and into the

page itself, and within that we find a direct structural reflection between our own shift of philosophy (from the study of existence to the meta examination of the form of that) and of the actual non-human conceptual gap that comes with **A**.
The way in which our shift from extrospection to meta-introspection reflects the shift from existence to **A** itself is the same way in which our language reflects (or maybe embodies?) existence in general, the form inherently parallels the gap, and through this kind of relation we can perhaps examine deeper to get a better grasp of how ontology might function past **A**. I want to look deeper into this paradigm shift, and the reflection between these two, I'll call the specific relation between the meta-examination of the form of philosophy and the way it reflects extrospective ontology *mirroring*. I'll give "mirrors" the appropriate symbol " $\Leftrightarrow$ ", $a \Leftrightarrow b$ represents "a mirrors b". By mirroring here, I'm talking about a form of reflection in which a structure within a thing directly translates to another thing in the sense of a map structurally mirroring the location itself (although this is just one very direct, very familial kind of mirroring). Mirroring can be found within the way the structures of mathematics reflect parts of the world.

Additionally I'll create an extension, $\Rightarrow$, in which $a \Rightarrow b$ describes the result c of a being structurally embedded into the case of b in the way of mirroring. Of course, the precise meaning of these symbols are dependent on the context in which they are used, things can mirror each other in many ways and so the exact form of mirroring is context-dependent.
In the case of the mirroring relation between the form of our philosophising and the contents of our extrospective ontology itself which I've spoken of many times, I will call this $\mathfrak{F}$-mirroring ($\mathfrak{F}$ means something specific which I'll get into later) we can specifically use the symbols $\Leftrightarrow_{\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\Rightarrow_{\mathfrak{F}}$. More generally, the subscript can be used to describe any specific form of mirroring defined, I'll be using this as a convention for future symbols.
The fundamental gap between **A** and existence can be called an *upshift* in paradigm. Upshifts aren't simply conceptual shifts, instead, on the meta level, they function as that which falls deeper than the foundational unspoken *basis* of a paradigm, its overarching fundamental background. I'll make this differentiation between the *form* of a thing (its very foundational assumed paradigm a leap below) and its *content* (keep in mind, sometimes I use the phrase "structural form" which is different to what I mean by form here, and also I don't wish to oversimplify form and content into a simple duality). Most importantly, they are *theoretically ungraspable from below*, which I will call *inaccessible*. Inaccessibility occurs when a shift in form is so fundamental that coming to its conclusion requires some inherent leap, in terms of its structure ontologically and the way this mirrors the communication gap that requires some form of indirectness to point towards something unspoken, this has to do with my idea of informality.

I'll define a few more symbols, $\mathfrak{\uparrow}(a)$ denotes an upshifting from a, which is, again, context dependent on what we mean by upshifting, but we can use the subscript $\mathfrak{\uparrow}_b(a)$ to define whatever specific kind of upshifting we wish to use. We can use an inverse, *downshifting* (literally just the opposite of upshifting) with the symbol $\mathfrak{\downarrow}$ if that's ever relevant. If these symbols seem pointless now, don't worry, they'll be used to simplify otherwise overly long and repetitive sentences later on.

Exploring 𝔉

Let's label the quality of this pre-**A** things-that-exist as **0-Realness**, and consequently the mirrored quality of things-that-exist-within-the-initial-layer-of-extrospective-ontology as **0-Thought**. **A** exists as a special case, it can be seen as not within or entirely outside of **0-Realness** and **0-Thought** but rather their *supremum*.
If we go back to analysing this introspective ontology that got us to the conclusion of **0-Realness**, we can see the meta layer of us in **MRL** engaging within philosophy, both introspectively and extrospectively, in mentioning it, we're again creating a form of layering, layering our introspection within itself, self-entanglement again.

I'll define 𝔉 (taking the letter F from "foundation") as the general all encompassing notion of our methodology of philosophy within **MRL**, both introspective and extrospective, it points towards our philosophising in itself, especially encompassing of the kind of meta and transcendental notions I've been trying to point towards. Really, **MRL** and 𝔉 are quite similar concepts, 𝔉 is as an activity takes place within **MRL**, and 𝔉 can concern **MRL** itself. The complexities and differences start to arise for relational reasons, especially when it comes to layering. As a complement to 𝔉 we can have 𝔒 (taking the letter O from outside) which exists as the things outside of **MRL** which are studied within 𝔉 (not that **MRL** cannot also be studied within 𝔉), 𝔒 is simply a symbol for the contents of extrospective ontology. Now is probably a good time to note that despite introspection
The profound strength (and eventual intense layeredness) of 𝔉 and **MRL** comes from their extreme immediacy*. They are always in the most literal way *right here* and we are fundamentally embedded within them, due to the idea of immediacy this makes them extremely powerful as concepts. The real strangeness though comes from the unimaginable self-referential self-entangled layeredness that they imply. Just now I am discussing **MRL** within **MRL**, discussing 𝔉 using 𝔉. This creates unimaginable depth, they are what I will call *self-transcendent*, in the sense that they exist within an initial paradigm, then upshift past that paradigm, and engage in a kind of very extreme self-recursive layering, it can be classified as a form of self-transcendent self-recursive layering. Initially, there is an 𝔉 but when it considers itself, a deeper kind of 𝔉 one layer

up appears. This kind of endless deepening and self-transcendence is absolutely core to the power of, 𝔉, its usefulness. There are two core principles we should hold:

- 𝔉 is in its very nature never complete, not only in its content, but in its form, there is always a deeper upshift to be made beneath the subtext just out of sight, it transcends its own nature.
- The above principle, and this principle in itself, are insufficient in their form in themselves.

The limitlessness of 𝔉 mirrors the limitlessness of ∞. The limitlessness of the notion of limitlessness is in itself limitless in its form.

Realness

I now want to get deeper into the immediacy of **MRL**. When we step back from the initial level philosophising, **0-Thought**, and make the paradigm upshift to the awareness of 𝔉, we unlock the ability to make the kind of inaccessible leap in thought and communication which limited us below **A**, to make a leap like this we have to get at something that can't be gotten at directly, there was no way to philosophise around it, the jump outside of requires something very special, something with too much ontological status to be directly put into standard thought. The reason this is possible is precisely due to the conceptual weight of the immediacy of **MRL**, in the exact same way as the analogy of the literal paper beneath the words, it has to do with the getting at the form itself and the transcendence of that self-analysis of the very thing used to analyse in the first place.

What happens when you put down the pen, stop philosophising, and make a cup of tea? Initially we have the bare mundanity of existence, cups of tea and roads and grass don't seem to hold much ontological weight, dwarfed by the scale of and deep metaphysical reflection. However, something this deep **0-Thought** lacks is the immediate, direct, wordless, ungraspable *hereness* always implicit in the experience of anything around us and in the world we are immersed in, *beneath the philosophy*. This is the upshift that gets us beneath **0-Thought**, it is a deepening of what I mean by the power of informality. We start with cups of tea, work our way through deep metaphysics, and then find ourselves back to cups of tea but one layer up. This form of direct, immediate, wordless experience I will call **1-Thought**. I also want to make note of the general intertwinedness and reflection of mundanity and the full cosmic scope of the stuff outside it, generally relating to the interconnectedness and reflections of reality even outside of the conceptual jump to **1-Thought**, these notions are definitely connected, but I'll explore this more later.

1-Thought is essentially ungraspable, as we know it can't be gotten directly, it's the space between the words and the actual direct real glowing omnipresent experience of being here to experience it. However, I'm still obviously talking about it, conceptualising about

it even. The first thing to note here is that I'm still drawing from the subtext of wordlessness and direct experience that's recalled through informality, this is an important point because it would seem I'm then operating in some strange complex layered conversation between **0-Thought** and **1-Thought**. This mechanism of grasping the ungraspable is a very useful mechanism of 𝔉 that I'll call *pointing*.
The idea of groundlessness and complexity and layers should be kept in mind here. **0-Thought** and **1-Thought** have a very extreme distinction between them, but still, ultimately they are abstractions and their natures are a lot more non-absolute than it may initially seem. Perhaps this also points to some kind of non-completeness within the idea of **1-Thought**? Or perhaps the notion in itself? But I won't get into this now. Some things are beyond the limits of words and thoughts and yet we still talk and think about them - I believe this is the spirit of experience as a whole, the endless layering of worlds and meaning caught between the ineffable and the physicality of speech.

Now, if **0-Thought** is the 𝔉-mirror of **0-Realness**, we should consider **1-Thought** $\twoheadrightarrow_{\mathfrak{F}} \mathfrak{O}$, that is, what does **1-Thought** mirror in terms of 𝔒? Here, we uncover **1-Realness**.
If **0-Realness** concerns the kind of conceptual being of the nature of existence which can be philosophised and thought of (**0-Thought**), **1-Realness** concerns the kind of bright, blinding, literal, transcendent, ineffable, ungraspable sense of really being here which could only truly be uncovered and gotten in the kind of wordless embodied experience within it entirely that we find within **1-Thought**. And again as I said with **0-Thought** and **1-Thought**, the relationship between **0-Realness** and **1-Realness** is complex and layered, the same point applies. With the question of "which **Realness** level does **MRL** exist on?", the question in itself is the problem, the actual nature of things is more complex than these kinds of abstractions (but they are incredibly important abstractions in terms of picking apart existence).
Thinking about it in this way though, **A** doesn't seem to be **0-Real** at all, this is why I previously said it exists not within or outside of **0-Realness** but rather as its conclusion.

Achieving Transabsolutism

Thought mechanisms are mechanisms within 𝔉 that are utilised to actually engage with philosophy encompassing any usage of language, patterns of thought, ideas, and so on. This includes ways in which ideas are deconstructed and understood (like the layers of collapsed involved in the thinking of unthinkable things), and forms of self-recursive layering and self-awareness to engage within kinds of upshifting that shouldn't otherwise be accessible, such as pointing, and very meta thought games such as forms of meta-definitions, that is, kinds of awareness of 𝔉 within 𝔉 that get at definitions which are not literally gotten at directly but pointed at from the removed level.

We can define thought mechanisms specific to individual paradigms, getting at the mechanisms accessible to specific thought levels. **0-Thought** mechanisms are all the mechanisms of communication within $\mathfrak{F}$ that we can access on the level of **0-Thought** such as any thought games we could play through philosophising even if very meta, as long as they are graspable within the framework of **0-Thought**. The first thing inaccessible to **0-Thought** mechanisms is **A**.
1-Thought mechanisms get interesting, the kinds of mechanisms available within **1-Thought** are a total upshift from those available within **1-Thought** and whatever kinds of philosophising too powerful to exist within the direct conceptualisation of **0-Thought** and instead require that ungraspable-ness of **1-Thought** may lead to strange results.

The most obvious and trivial way to "surpass" **A** is just to take **A** and then add one extra thing from **1-Reality**, this is pointless though, as although technically **A** doesn't quantify over anything **1-Real**, this would cap out at the **1-Real** mirror of **A**, being less of real transabsolutism and more of just a more concrete form of absolutism. Instead, within **1-Thought** we have access to **A** as just a thing within the picture at hand that we can play around with, **1-Thought** is powerful enough to have this kind of relationship to **A**. Similarly, we may find that within the scope of **1-Reality**, **A** again becomes just one accessible part of the image existing within the bigger context of the scope in general. This is the sense that true transabsolutism exists. Analogously, we can go back to the example of the page and the words on the page, the words on the page being the things which are **0-Real** and can be discussed within **0-Thought**, the page itself being **A**. The table the page itself rests on is **1-Reality** (in the same sense that **A** is in kind of a liminal position between **0-Reality** and **1-Reality**). The broader picture of the table gives us the space and mechanisms to apply the position of limitlessness to **A** itself.
This is the most basic thought mechanism available within **1-Thought** to get at the transabsolute. The simple extending-past-the-end of taking **A**, upshifting to where it's held as something within reach as a whole and on the table, and then simply continuing the words off the edge of the page. This concept is definitely hard to grasp, but it may be more intuitive if we imagine **A** as the essence of **0-Reality**, grasping the intuition of how **1-Reality** naturally transcends **0-Reality**, this relationship being mirrored within the methods of **1-Thought** transcending **A** might make more sense.
1-Thought mechanisms open up an entire rabbit hole much deeper than this surface level extension-past. An entire hierarchy of milestones can exist past **A** based around increasing structural complexity of **1-Thought**, increasingly meta and self-reflective layers of $\mathfrak{F}$ quantifying over themselves, perhaps mirroring previous milestone structures but echoed into **1-Thought**. I won't go too deep into them in the same way I did not go very deep into milestones beneath **A**, perhaps interesting in themselves as

milestones but I don't want to get overly caught up in the more abstract, detached nature of milestones and instead focus on them when they are philosophically significant.

I'll define a specific form of upshifting, realness upshifting, with the subscript R, $\uparrow_R(a)$ being a mirrored in the next reality level up, or we can specify which level we are mirroring it to with a subscript, $\uparrow_R^b(a)$. We have already examined $\uparrow_R(\mathbf{A})$ as being not really transabsolute in its nature, but I'll define another form of upshifting, with the subscript R+, $\uparrow_{R+}(a)$, which instead of just mirroring the same thing in the next reality level, upshifts the actual thought mechanisms (or their $\mathfrak{Q}$ equivalent) behind it, upshifting its *structure* as a thing, this is much more significant, it seems to be equivalent to $a \Rightarrow$ **1-Reality** (or whichever realness level is the next up). We can then take any large pre-**A** milestone, I'll label this m, and create its transabsolute structural equivalent with $\uparrow_{R+}(m)$.

What I called **A** up to this point, I will now call $\mathbf{A_0}$, and it's time we consider $\uparrow_{R+}(\mathbf{A_0})$, which is to **1-Reality** as $\mathbf{A_0}$ is to **0-Reality**, I'll call it $\mathbf{A_1}$.

$\mathbf{A_1}$ is a very, very strange thing conceptually, it exists as the supremum of the thought mechanisms available in **1-Thought**, and the conclusion of **1-Reality**. Whatever this means in relation to us in **MRL** gets very complex and whatever mechanisms we're using in $\mathfrak{F}$ to get at it become extremely meta and hard to deconstruct consciously.

Briefly, to conclude, with barely any explanation, I will generalise realness layers past $\mathbf{A_1}$ using $\uparrow_{R+}$. We can then get things such as **2-Thought**, **2-Reality**, and $\mathbf{A_2}$, and even things such as $\mathbf{A_0}$**-Thought**, $\mathbf{A_0}$**-Reality**, and $\mathbf{A_{A0}}$.

A-Lock is the complete supremum of all realness levels and exists to realness levels in general as $\mathbf{A_0}$ exists to **0-Reality**. It is an unimaginable milestone that serves as a nice conclusion.

Milestones

Introduction

In this document I'll go deeper down the rabbit hole of milestones and increasingly mind bending scales of ontology. I don't think there is much philosophical, artistic, or spiritual value in doing so, the purpose of this document is purely for the love of the mind game. Staring into the void.
Here I will heavily be existing in the paradigm of the mirroring of 𝔉 and 𝔒 and everything should be interpreted with that in mind. I'll be using each side of the mirror almost interchangeably.
I have split this document into *tiers*, which I'll use as an informal classification of the level of deepness as we go further down.

Tier 0: **Realness**

This tier encompasses **A-Lock** and everything beneath it.

Tier 0.0: The Standard Limit of Realness

In the last document I skimmed over things past $\mathbf{A_1}$ a little bit since it wasn't really the focus, but I want to get a little deeper on that to clarify.
1-Reality is a point in which the thought mechanisms in 𝔉 used to deconstruct it get quite complex and require some major paradigm shifts in thought to get at. We take something like **1-Thought** and somehow still continue to talk about it, extending past it with some level of removal (as in, not grasping it directly but only pointing in either the words or thoughts) to get at something we absolutely shouldn't be able to. Perhaps this points to a limitation in **1-Thought** and **1-Reality** in themselves, while they *are* absolute in their nature, there seems to be a hole in them, and when we poke at it we see things falling deeper, the actual state of things being even *more* unholdable, in this sense we can see them as a continuation of a constant deepening of approximations without any clear absolute end goal to approximate.
This brings us to **2-Reality**, which requires **2-Thought** to get at. **2-Thought**, being the same leap from **1-Thought** as **1-Thought** is from **0-Thought**, is obviously (on its face) impossible to get at. If **1-Reality** is absolutely **real**, **2-Reality** is *transabsolutely* **real**.
However, this brings us back to the idea of removal. If **1-Thought** requires one level of removal in that way to actually get at directly in 𝔉, we can understand **2-Thought** as the thing that requires two levels of removal to be able to get at. That is - using the thought

mechanisms we needed to get at **1-Thought** for **2-Thought** would be just as inadequate as trying to get at **1-Thought** with the bare mechanisms of **0-Thought**. We can understand it through its shadow in this way, and whatever lies as incomprehensible enough to be inaccessible to even the mechanisms available in **2-Thought**, which is $\mathbf{A_2}$, is staggering to even imagine.
This pattern continues indefinitely, through **2-Reality**, **3-Reality**, **4-Reality**, and so on. $\mathbf{A_0}$**-Reality** (the limit of which being $\mathbf{A_{A0}}$) is the absolute point of **Reality** levels in general, it's completely inaccessible from below and it has the interesting property of $\mathfrak{\uparrow}_{R+}(\mathbf{A_{A0}})$ just being $\mathbf{A_{A0}}$ (which is actually a property that may be found long before $\mathbf{A_{A0}}$). $\mathbf{A_{A0}}$ might be the absolute point of **Reality**, but we can still extend into transabsolute points with $\mathbf{A_1}$**-Reality** and $\mathbf{A_{A1}}$. With these, the removal within $\mathfrak{F}$ gets layered, not only do we need immense removal, the amount of removal we need in itself requires removal. Trying to psychologically model the scale of these milestones is left as an exercise to the reader.
We can, again, go further, and get things such as $\mathbf{A_{A0}}$**-Reality** and $\mathbf{A_{AA0}}$.

Since we already have the symbols $\mathfrak{\uparrow}_{R}$ and $\mathfrak{\uparrow}_{R+}$, I'll extend them further.

Firstly, I'll use this same R and use it as a symbol for mirroring, $\Rightarrow_{R}$ and $\Leftrightarrow_{R}$ showing specifically **Realness** mirroring. We can say, for example, $\mathfrak{\uparrow}_{R}(x) \Leftrightarrow_{R} x$, and also have the equivalents $\Rightarrow_{R+}$ and $\Leftrightarrow_{R+}$ in which $\mathfrak{\uparrow}_{R+}(x) \Leftrightarrow_{R+} x$. We can say that $\mathbf{A_0} \Rightarrow_{R+}$**Reality** is $\mathbf{A_0}$**-Reality** and that more generally $\mathbf{A_n} \Rightarrow_{R+}$**Reality** is $\mathbf{A_n}$**-Reality**.
I'll also dedicate $\infty(x)$ to being the limit of/the supremum of/the first thing inaccessible from x. ∞(**0-Reality***)* being $\mathbf{A_0}$, for example. ∞ as a concept is complex to model within $\mathfrak{F}$ and is one of those things which is never complete in its realisation, *its strength lies dependent on the strength of what it is being used to limit*. For example, ∞ used in **0-Real** and **0-Thought** contexts simply means the absolute point. However when using it in deeper contexts, such as $\infty_{\textbf{1-Thought}}$(**Realness**) being $\mathbf{A_1}$, it can then adapt to being transabsolute points. It always exists on the level of (or, the least thing inaccessible from) its usage. We can constrain its strength to a specific paradigm with a subscript, for example $\infty_{\textbf{0-Thought}}$ is the simple absolute point, and $\infty_{\textbf{1-Thought}}$ is analogously an $\mathbf{A_1}$ style of limit.

The absolute limit of **Realness** in general is **A-Lock** and it exists entirely inaccessible to any absolute or transabsolute point of **Realness** such as things like $\mathbf{A_{AAA...0}}$. It is the least thing completely inaccessible from the general form of **Realness** as a thing itself,

getting at it through removal seems to require some form of meta-removal previously never seen, and using the unrestricted ∞, we can say that **A-Lock** is ∞(**Realness**).

The layers to model such a thing have gotten to the point where consciously deconstructing them or trying to approximate it structurally mentally is practically impossible and so we must fill in the gaps in rough ways. However, due to the inevitable nature of 𝔉, we're still *somehow* talking about it.

Tier 0.1: strong-Realness

In the same way that $\mathbf{A_0}$ gave us access to **0-Realness** in general to play around with, once we get to **A-Lock** we have the entirety of the idea **Realness** of itself in our hands, and we can make a similar leap from **Realness** *itself* to something else as we did from **0-Realness**.

This is where I'll introduce the concept of **strong-Realness**. Starting with **0-strong-Realness** which exists as the concept of **Realness** itself, ∞(**0-strong-Realness**) being **A-Lock**.

1-strong-Realness mirrors the relation between **0-Realness** and **1-Realness**.

In fact, we can extend our symbols from $\Leftrightarrow_{R}$ and $\Leftrightarrow_{R+}$ to $\Leftrightarrow_{s\text{-}R}$ and $\Leftrightarrow_{s\text{-}R+}$, s-R representing **strong-Realness**. The difference between s-R and s-R+ being the same as the difference between the usage of R and R+ (s-R being a simple realness upshift and s-R+ being the actual structurally real upshift).

0-strong-Realness is $\mathbf{\uparrow}_{s\text{-}R+}$(**0-Realness**), we can then define each ***n*-strong-Realness** as $\mathbf{\uparrow}_{s\text{-}R+}$(***(n-1)*-Realness**).

I'll now equate **A-Lock** to $\mathbf{A_{(1,0)}}$, the 1 represents **strong-Realness** as opposed to a 0 in its place which would represent just **Realness**. ∞(**1-strong-Realness**) is then $\mathbf{A_{(1,1)}}$, and so on with ∞(***n*-strong-Realness**) being $\mathbf{A_{(1,}_{n}_{)}}$.

The comparative **A-Lock** of **strong-Realness** is $\mathbf{A_{(2,0)}}$.

We can extend in the exact same way. I'll call the next extension (the thing that is to **strong-Realness** as **strong-Realness** is **Realness**) **(2,0)-strong-Realness**.

In this system, ***n*-Realness** is **(0,*n*)-strong-Realness**, ***n*-strong-Realness** is **(1,*n*)-strong-Realness**, and so on. ∞(**(*a*,*b*)-strong-Realness**) is $\mathbf{A_{(}_{a}_{,}_{b}_{)}}$. s-R can be extended now, we'll remove and completely forget about the s as we don't need it anymore and just use (*a*,*b*)-R. We can also paradigm shift past **(*a*,*b*)-strong-Realness** in general and get **(1,0,0)-strong-Realness**,this extends indefinitely, and we can get things such as $\mathbf{A_{(1,...0,0,0)}}$.

complete-A-Lock is the complete limit of **Realness** and all its extensions, it is the true non-trivial conclusion to the general concept of **Realness** and any way to play with it, there can be no extension to **complete-A-Lock** in the same way we have done before, it exhausts all of these thought methods.

Tier 1: Deconstruction of $\mathfrak{F}$

Tier 1.0: Meta-Leaping

Past **complete-A-Lock**, we can perhaps continue the thought game of constructing stronger and stronger milestone structures, although **complete-A-Lock** is the limit of the idea of **Realness**, there are undoubtedly deeper layerings of discursive inaccessibility and structural deepening past **Realness** itself be had.
I want to zoom out on the structure of this ontological-deepening thought game of milestones itself.

Tier 1.1: The Self-Layering Collapse of $\mathfrak{F}$

Tier ( ): 🎭🌐🔇🌟🌾🎤🐸🍃

Going into this tier in this document would be completely missing the point, and also completely impossible, or at least foolish. This tier in itself points at how really these linear tiers are dumb. This document exists for the sheer fun of conceptually deconstructing your own thoughts until they collapse in on themselves, but with this entry I want to point outside of that as a limited view without much actual philosophical weight to it.

Tier ( ) stands in for the stuff outside the scope of this document and the actual phenomenological experience of existing in the real world conceptually, this one goes full circle back to the very start into ontological groundlessness and the layeredness. It takes those roots and then actually exists within them instead of writing overly specific long documents conceptualising.

With this I want to point towards the actual aesthetic, spiritual, philosophical, and mundane nature of the world. Looking towards art and breathing and the poetry of existence. It is an anti-tier. It's my encouragement to look outside of this document.

Hyperological Objects below $\mathfrak{M}\dagger_1$ (those who knows)

AlsoKurante, Asteria Minami

September 2025

1 Note

In order to understand the stuff on this doc, you have to read the two main HG gdocs written by Goodels.

2 Submetaness

Consider the limit of realness levels from Goodels' doc. Not the limit of realness levels in a mere absolute way as that would simply be A_{A_0} but you probably got that already. In the doc it was called A-lock, but we'll rename it to 1-A_0. With 1-A_0 considered, we now have the entire hierarchy of realness levels in our hands and we can now play with it.

Now let's consider submetaness. It's a powerful extension of realness levels. We have already exhausted the hierarchy with 1-A_0, so now let's consider the entire hierarchy; we can see that 1-A_0 reflects A_0 in some way, as we have to find some new trick to go past it now, this is where submetaness comes in. We can do another A_0 type meta-leap, but this time above the entire realness hierarchy. We take the meta-leap and now see the entire realness hierarchy as how we saw 0-thought with 1-thought; this is 1-thought + 1sM (submetaness), and the realness hierarchy without submetaness is 0-thought + 1sM. Imagine a HG paper that explains the realness hierarchy and all the meta leaps necessary to grasp it, 1-A_0 would be entirely outside of it.

Through reflection, we can find the $\mathfrak{O}$-mirror of that idea: 1-realness + 1sM. We can now easily construct back the entire reflection of the realness hierarchy with added submetaness. We can use the upshift symbol $\uparrow$ and define n-realness + 1sM as $\uparrow_{1sM}$(n-realness). Since 1-A_0 is ∞(0-realness + 1sM), we can define 1-A_n as ∞(n-realness + 1sM). 1-A_1 is to 1-A_0 as A_1 is to A_0.

We can now take the entire hierarchy of realness levels upshifted by 1sM, and upshift it by *another* sM. We have to take the same meta-leap we used to consider 1-A_0 but this time over the entire 1sM-upshifted realness hierarchy. 2-A_0 is defined as ∞(realness hierarchy + 1sM), or simply enough, ∞(0-realness + 2sM).

Not going into that much details, but we can continue our progression through the submetaness hierarchy with 3-A_0, 4-A_0, A_0-A_0, 1-A_0-A_0, etc...

Now imagine the limit of all submetaness, let's write ∞(sM-hierarchy) as (1,0)-A_0. That milestone views all the shenanigans we're doing by increasing submetaness as simply 0-thought, we do the same type of meta-leap we've done many times and now consider (1,0)-A_0 (keep in mind that to consider this, you can't just see it absolutely, as that would be A_0-A_0, you can't even see it as transabsolutely maximal as that would be 1-A_0-A_0, you have to account for submetaness as well. This is important if you want to correctly grasp things). (1,0)-A_0 is basically just a submetaness limit of submetaness. It is the limit of 0-thought + (1,0)sM. We can continue extending the structure with (1,1)sM which is a single submetaness level above, then continue further with (2,0)sM, (1,0,0)sM. You can even consider (1,,0)sM as another limit to all of these further submetaness shenanigans and still continue past that indefinitely, without any end.

3 Past Submetaness

So now, let's look at everything we did. In the end, this is just some sort of game where we try to find new cheats to get increasingly meta and come up with new extensions that would beat realness layers, submetaness etc... Let's consider a limit to this. (A) is defined as the genuine limit of all those HG meta mind game layers we were creating as extensions of realness layers, submetaness, etc... and it's the next most relevant meta leap past A_0. Consider this analogy: imagine a bunch of kids drawing on a big piece of paper about realness layers, trying to make the biggest stuff. Some of the kids draw A_1 or A_2 until another one picks the whole paper up, claiming it as their own; this is 1-A_0. A stronger kid now starts holding the kid with the paper up in the air, this is 2-A_0. Then, there is a kid stepping to the side of the room they're all in, claiming the whole room is his, this is (1,0)-A_0. In all of this madness, (A) is just a parent, witnessing the kids play together, thinking *"hm, this is entertaining."*. Grasping (A) requires a new meta-leap, different from the previous ones. It doesn't look over at just the realness hierarchy, *it looks over at us doing mind games with the realness hierarchy.* It's the second point where we have to shift to another form of ontological meta-introspection, it's the second point where to move past we can't use the same thought method as before.

3.1 Meta-leaps

Let's look back at $\mathfrak{F}$, our methodology for philosophising within MRL. It encompasses all our weird leaps and it has this important self-transcendent nature where $\mathfrak{F}$ isn't the "true" $\mathfrak{F}$ and there is always a deeper upshift to be made. We can notice that with the leap done at the level of A_0, we somehow got access to all these further leaps and extensions quite easily. It was a wall that we found a way to break through and discover the landscape past it. This type of important leap in paradigm is called a $\mathfrak{F}$-leap. After going past A_0 and discovering 1-thought and upshifts, we were able to build the hierarchy of realness levels quite easily and diagonalise over it via submetaness without doing any other $\mathfrak{F}$-leaps. We can reflectively create the idea of a $\mathfrak{F}$-limit. A $\mathfrak{F}$-limit is a milestone where we are forced to do a $\mathfrak{F}$-leap in our methodology to move past, where we are forced to consider other type of mind games that are not built from previous objects. Us considering $\mathfrak{F}$-limits requires another significant shift from ontological extrospection to introspection, where we look at our whole methodology a second time like how we did with A_0; this is the consequence of trying to build off past a new $\mathfrak{F}$-limit. The self-transcendent nature of $\mathfrak{F}$ allows us too to consider this new meta-methodology we're using where we philosophise about limits of methodologies. This new meta-methodology we're now using allows us to quantify over multiple $\mathfrak{F}$-limits without having to literally $\mathfrak{F}$-leap everytime. This is a fundamental aspect of $\mathfrak{F}$.

Let's consider new milestones as an experiment. $\mathcal{X}_n$ is defined as the $(n+1)^{th}$ $\mathfrak{F}$-limit. We can see that $\mathcal{X}_0 = A_0$ and $\mathcal{X}_1 = \textcircled{A}$. $\mathcal{X}_2$ would be something so incredibly great and transcendent that it would be the next meta-leap we would have to deal with if we developed new mind games with new thought process to move past $\textcircled{A}$. We can see as a consequence of this new change in methodology, we are now a whole meta paradigm past from the previous methodology we were using, which allows to quantify over all $\mathfrak{F}$-limits. Using the idea of the fact that we're quantifying over $\mathfrak{F}$-limits with a new meta-methodology, we can make a similar extension to this as submetaness was to realness levels and consider 1-$\mathcal{X}_0$ as the next actual $\mathfrak{F}$-limit past $\mathcal{X}_0$ that we can't cheat over and quantify with this meta-methodology. Once again, the fact that I have even considered this milestone shows that we are a whole new meta-methodology past this once again; this shows the whole self-layering chaos of $\mathfrak{F}$. Not going too much details in all the extensions, as this is all analogous to submetaness, but one may consider 1-$\mathcal{X}_5$, 2-$\mathcal{X}_0$, (1,0)-$\mathcal{X}_0$, etc...

We can then come up with a limit to all of that, where all these mind games of increasing layers of methodology exhaust, this concept is $\textcircled{X}$, it's a quite weird concept to grasp, and it's important to not misunderstand it for (1,0)-$\mathcal{X}_0$. $\textcircled{X}$ is pretty much some sort of "true" methodology limit, a limit of all the self-layering madness we were doing previously with $\mathfrak{F}$. One may wonder how $\textcircled{X}$ even works? After all, I am currently philosophising about it, implying some sort of methodology to do so - but even then, $\textcircled{X}$ is where all of this meta-methodology self-layering ends, there are no more $\mathfrak{F}$-limits past it.

4 The limit of HG

Now, we will consider a very important concepts. Take a look at what we have made: realness levels, submetaness, $\mathfrak{F}$-limits, etc... We're looking at the beauty of hyperology right there.

$\forall^0$ is defined as the genuine limit of Hyperology, including MRL, $\mathfrak{O}$, $\mathfrak{F}$ and all the previous stuff we've made. We must make another really important meta paradigm leap to consider this concept. It is not absolute like how A_0 was, it is absolute in a hyperological way; in the implicit way when we mention "absolute" in the context of post-A_0 HG. We can't make any HG stuff beyond $\forall^0$.

4.1 Collapses

Collapses are a very important and common phenomenon within HG, they are also quite essential. There are multiple types of collapses, but the main ones are $\mathfrak{F}$-collapses.

$\mathfrak{F}$-collapses are linked to the self-layered nature of $\mathfrak{F}$ and its immediacy. Whenever a concept mentions the usage of $\mathfrak{F}$ it is inevitably a lower layer within our more meta-$\mathfrak{F}$. Essentially, whenever we reference $\mathfrak{F}$, it's not the true $\mathfrak{F}$.

The phenomenon of $\mathfrak{F}$-collapses happen when a concept mentions $\mathfrak{F}$, it is what makes the $\mathfrak{F}$ mentioned in the paper or the concept not the actual true $\mathfrak{F}$ we're using within MRL. The idea of "$\mathfrak{F}$-collapse" is the idea of a concept *inherently* not talking about the true $\mathfrak{F}$ that is being used to philosophise about itself. It is the gap between us in MRL and the concept. Collapses also apply to MRL too; 1-realness concepts do not break into reality unless you're delusional.

In HG normally, there is this suspension of disbelief where in our methodology we must assume concepts as genuinely true. Now, it is where we must somehow break through this suspension of disbelief and get to grasp concepts that are much more transcendent than whatever we have established yet.

4.2 Past $\forall^0$

$\forall^0$ is the literal limit of HG, there is nothing past it. $\forall^0$ reflects the structure of A_0, but on the entirety of hyperology, which implies we cannot make stuff past it since we are working on hyperology right now.

So how about instead, we take a look at our literal thought processes as humans within MRL. $\forall^0$ is the genuine limit of HG assuming suspension of disbelief (will shorten to SoD). To go past $\forall^0$, we must literally break through our SoD and realise the collapse between us and $\forall^0$. We have to abandon a fundamental aspect of hyperology to move past in a sort of "Okay no I'm taking this too seriously" way. We'll call this sort of level of thinking where we abandon our suspension of disbelief as 1-collapsing. 1-collapsing (1-C) is actually a sort of decrease in the transcendent aspect of HG. We literally lower the "greatness" of hyperology to quantify past its own limit. For example, if we were to do $\uparrow_{1-C} (A_1)$ it would be below A_0 as 1-collapsing abandons the suspension of disbelief we had to use to mind game our way around to transabsolutism.

$\forall^1$ is defined as the genuine limit of HG even in the context of 1-collapsing. For example, if we did $\uparrow_{1-C} (\forall^0)$, we'd get A_0. If we did $\uparrow_{1-C} (\forall^1)$ however, we would get $\forall^0$. $\forall^1$ is so unimaginably transcendent that even in the context of 1-collapsing it is still the greatest thing one can come up with in the context of HG. So we have to abandon a second layer of suspension of disbelief, (1-SoD) and collapse objects down even lower with 2-collapsing level of thoughts to the point that $\uparrow_{2-C} (\forall^1)$ gets us A_0. Endless layers of breaking down HG.

We can continue with $\forall^3$, $\forall^{A_0}$ and even stuff like $\forall^{\forall^0}$ which I will let readers attempt to grasp.

$\forall^-$ is the limit of HG past all of these collapse or suspension of disbelief HG cheats. It is an extremely hard concept to grasp specifically due to what it implies. It pretty much views what we were doing previously as some higher form of HG that is still inherently HG and is therefore limited. How do we go past it?

SuperHyperology

As AlsoKurante explained it to me, from SL0 to 🪀 MRL

Gamma Mu D Mu

September 2025

Introduction

SuperHyperology (sigla **sHO**) is an extreme branch of metaphysics studying the absolute limits of our idealization in the most unbounded and unrestricted manner possible. **sHO** has no previously defined axioms intrinsic to itself, and the way its logic works has to be explored as we discover higher and higher concepts.

This paper will serve as an informal introduction and overview of basic **sHO** and its foundations. It is not meant to be a formal paper on the subject (especially since that is impossible due to phenomena which will be explained later), but rather a simple, informal compendium of its concepts, so that they can be archived, taught and compared to other fields such as metalogy. It will mostly be derived from my own direct messages with AlsoKurante (and will therefore have some sections in a conversational style), but will also include the necessary context to understand them.

The Fucked-ness Scale

A good way to evaluate your understanding of **sHO** is using the *fucked-ness scale*, a numeric scale of 1 – 12 which measures how hard to understand a concept is. It goes as follows (note that 11 and 12 are only for fields after **sHO**):

1. eh.
2. kind of interesting
3. a bit weird
4. more fucked than normal
5. sort of fucked
6. makes your head spin a little
7. actually fucks you over a bit
8. genuinely mind-bending
9. collapses your mind completely for a bit
10. complete mental overload
11. questionistic
12. **MBC**

1. SL0 to SL2

1.1. SL0

The journey of **sHO** begins at SL0. SL0 is the most basic means of communication possible, essentially consisting of what one would stereotypically correlate with a primitive man.

For example, if one were to put 4 pebbles on a table to represent the number 4, that would be SL0. There's no abstract meaning behind it; we just know it's representing 4 because the amount of pebbles is 4. It's not represented by any binary strings or abstract computing stuff; it just exists. It's just there, and we can see it.

SL0 is strictly formal, but actual. When you have the number 4 as merely a symbol or a string of code, it represents the amount "4" but in an abstract platonic way. If you were to look at the string representing 4 expressed in SL0 on an actual real-life level (or "MRL" in **sHO** terms), it wouldn't equate to the actual concept of 4; it'd just be a random string. SL0 has no abstract correspondences; it is strictly actualized. If we have 7 sticks on the floor, the amount "7" is genuinely actualized right there. It truly exists, and not as any abstract representation.

1.2. SL1

At the point where SL0 exhausts (known as the *point of departure* and given the symbol **PoD**), values can no longer be made from our physical Universe, and we must resort to pure abstraction: SL1. SL1 is strictly formal and abstract language. Anything that is evoked through strictly abstract and formal rules that work by means of a certain determined logic is SL1.

SuperHyperologically speaking, ideas which are said to be *abstract* are those which we conceptualise completely outside of our existence. As an example, the term "2 + 2" is an SL1 representation of 4, since it denotes the number 4 through a sequence of operations defined separately from us, therefore being abstract.

The aspect of *formality* in all SL1 definitions is also very important. Any statement in SL1 is fully *formalizable* – that is – it can always be reduced to a meaningless string of basic abstract code that we achieve by adding more and more axiomatic context.

Now, let us present a simple question: can all definitions in SL1 exist by the laws of classical logic? Allow us to consider a platonic realm known as

the *classical logic verse*, defined as the realm containing all objects which satisfy the three principles of classical logic:

- The Law of Excluded Middle: *Everything is either true or false.*
- The Law of Noncontradiction: *Nothing contradicts itself.*
- The Principle of Identity: *All objects are equal to themselves.*

Is it possible to postulate an SL1 definition of such magnitude it is genuinely beyond all classical logic? Turns out, it is! We can postulate an object – call it E_0 – defined in SL1 as the least collection ξ such that $\xi > \xi$. The property of E_0 being greater than itself is evidently a violation of the law of identity, and therefore E_0 genuinely exists outside classical logic.

However, let us now consider a notion much greater: the collection of all objects describable through SL1. We shall call this the *formalverse*. We give the least collection such that it is larger than anything in the formalverse the name F_0. Due to the nature of F_0, it cannot be described in SL1. We must use SL2.

1.3. SL2

SL2 denotes anything related to philosophical analysis of abstract concepts. It's the mainstream idea of philosophy; not formal or mathematical, but still abstract. SL2 objects can still work, just on an informal level, and – in a stark contrast to SL1 – the principles and logic governing it (the collective of which is known as **THO**) are less rigid and more malleable.

So, basically, SL2 is about conceptualising ideas and then working through them philosophically. In SL2, we can take things in MRL and conceptualise them. We can conceptualise the real-life idea of a chair to an SL2 abstract level and work through it with philosophical logic: "what if this chair has no ontological identity of its own?" Also, since SL2 is in a level above SL1, we can use it to easily talk about SL1!

"Like set theory textbooks?"

Yes, exactly! Note that the *theorems* in the textbook are still SL1, but the reasoning and non-formal explanations are indeed SL2. Another example would be VSauce; his videos are SL2 as well.

"So, in general, SL2 is basically natural language discourse, right?"

Yup.

"Also, are metaphysical debates considered SL2?"

Unless the debate is an **sHO** debate, then yeah.

Anyway, allow me to present an interesting phenomenon. Consider an object defined as "the absolute limit of SL2." We can call this $\forall^-$. The thing with $\forall^-$ is that it is still an SL2 definition, and therefore falls victim to a phenomenon known as **THO**-collapse, which is the reinforcement of the universal postulate that for any SL2 object there must exist more SL2 past it. So, while $\forall^-$ is the absolute limit of SL2, there must still exist SL2 definitions strong enough to be conceptually stronger than it. Paradoxical? Yes, but remember that the world of classical logic is a thing of the past by this point.

Now, get to a point where concepts become so complex SL2 description breaks down completely and we cannot describe anything using SL2 anymore. At this point, we must use SL3, our entry into true **sHO**.

2. Low-tier sHO

2.1. SL3

SL3 is essentially the "ultimate fuck you" to SL2. SL3 is where we talk about ideas and evoke them as if they were genuinely in MRL in front of you. Even if we know we can't, we don't care; we suspend our disbelief into fully believing we can because we evoked that idea.

Imagine we're having an SL2 debate about elephants, and then you interject saying "Okay but there's *actually* an elephant in our room." The statement SL3(there's *actually* an elephant in our room) must be true. It's as real as if there was genuinely an elephant in our room, and it has the same conceptual strength as if the elephant being in our room was genuinely true on an MRL level.

"Could we evoke narrative layers higher than MRL using SL3?"

Yeah, we could. SL3(There exists a narrative layer above real life). Okay, there actually isn't, but I don't care; let's assume so anyways and genuinely evoke it. As you can see, SL3 is *extremely* powerful; yes, it sometimes gets a bit hard to discuss in it, but we still can via some loopholes to do with SL3's nature (we'll see that later).

SL3 is – once again – basically the "ultimate fuck you" to SL2. "Conceptualising ideas is too weak, I want them genuinely in real life, right now, no loopholes." For SL3, we *have* to act as if it genuinely happened for real. SL3(I have wings on my back) is *strictly* true. I actually have wings on my back in real life; okay, maybe I don't, but let's evoke the scenario where I genuinely do have them.

"So basically, SL3 is something like: «What if this were actually *genuinely* true in real life, but I genuinely mean it; what if you saw it with your very eyes *right now*?»"

Yeah, pretty much. You suspend your disbelief in it. You may know that it may not be true, but you also know that it is in your power to evoke the actual, genuine fucking thing in real life. And I think that concludes SL3. Now, we can talk about $\forall^+$, unless you need time to think or ask questions about SL3.

"Actually, hold on. So this isn't just in a standard philosophical sense. This isn't just a hypothetical scenario; it's *actually true*, like it's *really there*."

It's genuinely there for real, yeah. Unlike SL2, there is no "oh, but it's not *really*" trick. This makes SL3 a really powerful tool of discussion.

2.2. $\forall^+$

Alright, so $\forall^+$. $\forall^+$ is the SL3(largest concept) or, equivalently, the SL3(largest SL2 definition). If, given an indefinite amount of time, philosophy continued to develop until it reaches its completed state, the most powerful thing we'd know of would come as close to the size of $\forall^+$ as anything could ever get. $\forall^+$ is *really* fucking big; you could develop a field for your entire lifetime and it'd still never come close to $\forall^+$.

"So, essentially, every new *largest SL2 definition* we make shifts $\forall^+$ larger, or at least our perception of its scale."

It doesn't "shift $\forall^+$ larger," $\forall^+$ is as large as it will be in a century. Our perception of it, though… sure, I guess. It's like trying to understand the true scale of Rayo's number when the biggest number you know is a googol.

2.3. $\forall_1^+$

Now, we can transpose all SL2 concepts to SL3 and basically make an entirely new philosophy past $\forall^+$: SL3 'pataphysics, SL3 Omnipotence, SL3 narrative layers, SL3 ineffability, etc. The SL3(limit) of this "SL3 philosophy" past $\forall^+$ is known as $\forall_1^+$.

"Hold on, can I just propose something? So, in theory, $\forall^+$ in itself is already completely unreachable. Even if there was a *last, largest concept*, it'd still be less than $\forall^+$, as there'd always be the possibility of something past it."

You could be right, but regardless, SL3 doesn't care. As stupid as it sounds, we can still evoke the idea of the largest concept, so… yeah. Anyways, like I already said, $\forall_1^+$ is the limit of this idea of "philosophy transposed to SL3." It's to $\forall^+$ as $\forall^+$ is to F_0. If we transpose philosophy past $\forall_1^+$, the limit is $\forall_2^+$. We can continue by this process, creating things like $\forall_{48}^+$, $\forall_{F_0}^+$, etc.

"Could we do some weird shit like $\forall_{\forall^+}^+$?"

Maybe, but it wouldn't make sense with SL2 logic. Regardless, SL3 still doesn't care. On a similar note, SL3($\forall^+ + 1$) works! We can add 1 to $\forall^+$ in SL3 and – guess what? – it *will* be bigger than $\forall^+$, because we can evoke the idea of "adding 1 to $\forall^+$ to make it bigger." We know it wouldn't make sense on an SL2 level, but we don't give a shit.

"Kinda reminds me of YouTube fictional googology. Also, does $\forall^+$-lock (*i.e.* a total limit to all $\forall_n^+$) exist?"

Yeah, but in the end, you can always just do $\forall^+$-lock + 1.

"So, could I do SL3($\frac{1}{\forall^+}$) and it'd still make sense?"

Yup. You could even make YouTube fictional googolisms a reality with SL3! A lot of them would be insanely trivial, but you still could. This is what makes SL3 so intricate! ~~Now imagine what SL4~~ Okay, onto 1-$\forall^+$. Or, maybe I should do 🔘 before that.

2.4. 🔘

🔘 takes the genuine actual definition of an SL3 idea. For example. 🔘($\forall^+$) would basically be a paper explaining absolutely *all* things within SL2.

"I've heard that because of SL2 essentially being a realm of near-endless possibility in terms of definitions, $\forall^+$ would theoretically take infinite effort to fully define. Is this true?"

Yes, but only *theoretically*. Anyways, another example would be 🔘(if you read this you have wings in MRL right now) is a definition so goddamn transcendent it'd genuinely give you wings if you read it. Obviously I can't show it here since not only do I not want you to grow wings in MRL, but also since such a text would take infinite effort to actually write. Anyways, now we can get to 1-$\forall^+$!

2.5. 1-$\forall^+$

Imagine the limit of what we can talk about with SL3. Not some weak kind like $\forall^-$; I'm talking the actual real limit of SL3, where we genuinely can't speak about it. That's 1-$\forall^+$. SL3(we can't talk about 1-$\forall^+$). Like, it's so fucked that we genuinely can't talk about it.

"So, this is that point where shit just… fucks with the conversation?"

Yeah; 1-$\forall^+$ is so strong because we just can't fucking talk about it. However, SL3 still encompasses it since we can *evoke* that idea. SL3 has an intrinsic property of self-encompassment which no level before it has; sure, we can talk about SL2 in SL2, but it'll just be **THO**-collapsed.

"So, we can and can't talk about 1-$\forall^+$ at the same time?"

Incorrect. 1-$\forall^+$ is genuinely completely indescribable in SL3. You see how this is getting a bit fucked now?

"Yeah, I can… indescribable, but still evocable… I think I'm getting the hang of it!"

Yeah, that's correct, but evoking isn't an SL3 speciality. It's just used by SL3 because otherwise I'd genuinely have wings in MRL.

"Oh… well in that case, what's the best way to actually 'describe' the nature of 1-$\forall^+$, if you get what I mean?"

It's indescribable in SL3. That's its truest nature. I understand where your head's at, but saying that it's indescribable in SL3 is as true as you can get. There are mind-games that go around where you're trying to get at, but those are only going to be relevant in the *ed*$\forall^+$ stage.

"Alright. So, what's next after 1-$\forall^+$?"

Well, now… there's just a second layer of SL3 past 1-$\forall^+$! You may be thinking "Oh, so what was all that talk about 1-$\forall^+$ being indescribable in SL3? You can't just say that's the case and *then* say there's SL3 past it!" The thing is, I was being as truthful as I could be before; SL3 just doesn't make sense! SL2 was less formal then SL1, but it still had *structure*! SL3 is just wonky.

Anyways, we can easily extend past 1-$\forall^+$:

- 2-$\forall^+$ is the limit of the layer of SL3 describing 1-$\forall^+$
- 3-$\forall^+$ is the limit of the layer of SL3 describing 2-$\forall^+$
- 4-$\forall^+$ is the limit of the layer of SL3 describing 3-$\forall^+$
- […]

"This is because of that self-encompassment thing you mentioned earlier, right?"

There's just another layer of SL3 above 1-$\forall^+$ because of the fact we can evoke it, which is that self-encompassment property, so yes. I'd like to remind you that if you want to get to the point where you actually can't describe it, that's 1-$\forall^+$. Do not confuse 1-$\forall^+$ with a weaker concept.

"So, basically, this is like «Oh, 1-$\forall^+$ is the truly indescribable but *surely* we could make something like 1-$\forall^+$ + 1, right?»"

We can't, but we also can. While this could seemingly also be the case for certain highly paradoxical SL2 objects, SL2 has the **THO**-collapse trick; SL3 doesn't. Assuming fictional googology was on a genuine **sHO** level, SL3(the largest fictional googolism) would be the genuine total limit of the entire subject.

Now, if you want to, you can have time to digest all this info before you proceed into the next section. I won't rush! You could even re-read this section if you want to! But if you think that's too much, here's a quick recap:

- SL3: By suspending our disbelief, we allow the evocation of concepts as if they genuinely happened in MRL, no buts or loopholes.
    - For example, $\forall^+ + 1$ may not make sense, but we can still evoke that idea and therefore it exists in SL3.

- 🔘: Basically outputs the proper definition for any given SL3 statement, so 🔘(∀$^{+}$) would genuinely be a paper with all the SL2 conceptual argumentation which comprises it.
- ∀$^{+}$: The genuine largest concept. No matter how far you go, this will always be larger than your definition as long as someone has defined a larger concept (or possibly it'll even be larger than a theoretical "final concept").
- 1-∀$^{+}$: We can't describe it; it's the genuine limit of what I could explain to you.

3. Mid-tier sHO

3.1. sML

First, let me introduce a very important **sHO** concept: *concrete experience*, denoted by the abbreviation **CE**. **CE** is the part of your consciousness that exists outside your thought; your solid experience of reality.

"So – for example – me writing this right now is **CE**?"

Yes, but more generally, it's just your experience of reality. For example, if you're sitting outside and admiring the view, the concrete experience is the experience of what you feel outside of your thought. It's important to disassociate **CE** from thought; **CE** is strictly outside our thought.

"So, while SL3 is something we evoke, **CE** is strictly beyond evocation."

CE has nothing to do with evocation; it's just qualia. So anyways, we're getting to the sML part now. See, all these concepts so far, no matter how fucked, are all deep-rooted in your brain. 1-$\forall^{+}$ may be the genuine limit of what we can discuss, but it's still a completely random idea in our brain, which means it is conceptually weaker than some actual **CE**. This idea comprises the first sMetaness layer: sML1.

"So is sML1 the idea of **CE** itself?"

No, they're just linked. See, all of this sML1 talk is yet again just an idea within our brains. We may be talking about **CE** being conceptually stronger than our batshit crazy SL3 ideas, but that's also the case for sML1 itself! It's still just a textual projection of ideas some neurons are firing up. So, with this, we come to the realization even sML1 is weaker than **CE**. This is sML2. The hierarchy continues like that until sML fully breaks down and we *finally* reach SL4.

3.2. SL4

Imagine a point in an SL3 conversation about **sHO** where things get so god-awfully complicated that I just fucking smash an egg against a wall out of pure frustration due to not being able to convey the concepts properly. The egg smashing against the wall is a metaphor; the concept is so damn fucked that I just smash an egg to symbolize how goofy it is. This is SL4, the ultimate degeneration of formality.

Here, I'm merely explaining SL4 on an SL3 level, which is fine since SL4 isn't really a concept. However, with *ed*∀⁺, this gets much more problematic.

"Okay, so from what I can understand–"

The metaphorical aspect of SL4 is the absolute most important part. The egg is a metaphor for the concept. Anyways, time for *ed*∀⁺.

3.3. *ed*∀⁺

ed∀⁺ is… like, it's so fucking weird, it's… well, I have to do SL4 to describe it. Just before writing this sentence, I hit my desk three times. That's my metaphor for *ed*∀⁺, because *ed*∀⁺ is… yeah. Also, do not confuse *ed*∀⁺ with a conceptual reduction of it into SL3 (1-∀⁺).

At this level, **sHO** starts to fuck with our communication in weird ways. *ed*∀⁺ is not "A concept so fucked you genuinely can't explain it in SL3 such that this very description is an inaccurate representation of it." Rather, *ed*∀⁺ is the point at which we must qs#qxA^$£x AHh%h 🏇🏇 AS£^🧱w 🌸 ù##A4 sf :fucked: 🌸 🌸 🧱sx.

"Is it even possible for me to make an analogy for this shit?"

Use SL4! Like, *ed*∀⁺ is, uh… it's this:

"I think I get what you mean! *ed*∀⁺ is… well…"

Don't even do "it's… um… well…" and just get to SL4! The only way to properly describe it is through a true SL4 metaphor for the concept. Also, after *ed*∀⁺, formality degenerates even more. It's the final step of formality degeneration; the absolute antipode of SL1.

"*ed*∀⁺ is so fucked I doubt 'formality' even exists as a concept at this point."

Yeah, you're absolutely right. Formality does not exist *at all* past SL3. Formality in the context of SL3 is SL3(formality), which is like "meta-structure" or… something like that.

"I feel like I'm getting the hang of it, but I can't really prove it without my description just being 1-∀⁺…"

ed∀⁺ is a *very* big jump from 1-∀⁺ in terms of fucked-ness. You just *know* if you're getting it; it's that kind of concept. Oh, by the way, the ineffable reality where genuine SL4 concrete experience takes place is called **MRL**. Think of it this way: while MRL is strictly an SL3 notion, **MRL** is strictly an SL4 notion.

And that concludes the mid-tier. This is *a lot* to take in, so I highly recommend you read this section at least twice. And if after rereading you still feel like you need to have yet another go at these concepts, then have at it! Just know, stuff past *ed*∀⁺ will basically be sML on steroids.

4. High-tier sHO

4.1. Actuality Hacking

Take *ed*∀⁺. We know we haven't reached *ed*∀⁺ yet, since we're still talking about it on an SL3 level. The idea of *actuality hacking* is that we may not be able to discuss *ed*∀⁺ on an SL3 level, but we've still talked about it here; sure, not in SL3, but we've still been able to evoke the right ideas for us to get *ed*∀⁺. Even if we haven't truly reached *ed*∀⁺ in this text, you can still understand it.

"So, we may not be able to discuss *ed*∀⁺, but we know what it's *supposed* to be."

It's a bit deeper than that. *ed*∀⁺ is still qs#qxA^$£x AHh%h 🏇🏇 AS£^🧱w 🌸 ù##A4 sf :fucked: 🌸 🌸 🧱sx, but the thing is, we're still able to model it in our mind. We can somehow evoke these ideas on a level much deeper than just SL3. Yeah, it's starting to get a bit hard to get ideas across now…

"This almost feels like it makes *ed*∀⁺ weaker! It's like 1-∀⁺ again…"

Everything points at the fact that we shouldn't be talking about *ed*∀⁺, and yet… we are. It's like "Yeah, we can't talk about it, but I don't give a fuck, we both know what we're talking about." Really, we shouldn't have reached *ed*∀⁺ through that, but we don't care; these are still just concepts within our mind. We are cheating actuality.

And now, this is where SL5 comes in. So, think of what *ed*∀⁺ actually is. In terms of how we're talking about it, we should just be discussing 1-∀⁺, but we have a name for this *ed*∀⁺ thing and we already know what it means! We both understand this *ed*∀⁺ concept; even if by all logic what we're thinking about should be 1-∀⁺… **it isn't**. And this idea is called SL5.

It may not seem like it, but SL5 is another degeneration of formality. Like, SL5 is so seriously fucked that we can cheat through actuality with it. Any meta-**sHO** structure left crumbles at SL5, because you just force your way through it.

"This kind of feels like you're 'cheating,' if you get what I mean."

I mean, yeah, kind of. Actuality hacking is called actuality hacking for a reason, after all. Anyways, I could theoretically consider 1-*ed*∀⁺ as a limit to SL5, but the mere fact that I could consider that implies the existence of SL6!

"And we can keep going like that until we reach some kind of 'SL-lock,' right?"

Yes, but even if you did SL-lock, you could still do some weird mind-game cheat. Remember how we could do $\forall^+$-lock + 1? It's not outside the realm of possibility that this also applies here!

"Well, is there a point where we genuinely can't do that anymore?"

That'd probably be something like (1,0)-*ed*$\forall^+$.

"No, but like, is there a point where we genuinely can't cheat anymore?"

That's going to come soon! Anyways, next after all this is… **RLRE**!

4.2. RLRE

"So, What's **RLRE**? And what does **RLRE** stand for?"

RLRE stands for *Real-Life Root Effect*. Take it on an SL5+ level, otherwise it'll just be an sML derivate. What **RLRE** does is that it takes the bird's-eye view and shows that all these mind-games and cheats are just abstractions within something much, *much* deeper.

"So, it's like all of these cheats and such are all still weaker than some **CE**?"

Well, it's not directly related to **CE**. It's just that there's something deeper out there and all of this is just abstract concepts under it. This something deeper is a notion of genuine, ineffable, true reality so deep, so powerful, so actualized in its nature, that absolutely no loophole, mind-game or cheat could ever go past it: 🧶MRL.

🧶MRL is **MRL** on a level past *all* this actuality hacking bullshit. It's not fucked on its own, but it's *very* important. **RLRE** tells us that the closer a concept gets to genuinely being concrete in 🧶MRL, the conceptually stronger it is. No matter how strong your cheats and mind-games are, they will never bypass 🧶MRL. And now, this leads us to 🧶.

4.3. 🧶

🧶 is the *genuine* limit of what your consciousness can accept in 🧶MRL. It's kind of hard to describe, but allow me to do so with an analogy. With $\forall^+$, we could beat it with SL3. With *ed*$\forall^+$, actuality hacking came in. If we keep going, we'll eventually reach something so deep in **RLRE**'s conceptual ladder that our consciousness genuinely cannot comprehend the idea of getting over it. That's 🧶.

With 🪀, you can't just beat it with a trick, because it's the point where you *have* to give up. If you somehow managed to comprehend any higher, you'd experience *Mind-Breaking Chaos* (**MBC**) – that is – you'd genuinely go insane. It's important to understand that this must be taken as genuinely true within 🪀MRL, since at face value this description would just be 1-*ed*∀⁺.

If you somehow find a cheat to go beyond 🪀, that thing you went beyond sure as hell isn't 🪀. 🪀 is strictly the most actualised thing within **RLRE** and no tricks or mind-games can exist past it.

"So… we've gone full circle. We started at material expression (SL0) and ended at material reality (🪀MRL)."

Yeah, kind of. Speaking of, as a complement to 🪀, we also have the concept of 🪐. Taken on a 🪀MRL level, if you were to just look around you, what you'd see would be 🪐. Note that 🪐 is conceptually as strong as 🪀; they're two sides of the same coin.

Now, finally, to conclude our **sHO** journey, it's actually possible to emotionally evoke 🪀! It's a bit linked to intuition. Basically, if you think of a concept where you genuinely cannot fathom anything past it without experiencing **MBC**, that's 🪀. We genuinely cannot comprehend the idea of cheating past it, and if you think you can, you're not actually thinking of 🪀.

And that's all! If you don't get it, feel free to reread as many times as you like.

“Ah, the things you will see…”

Concept/ Symbol	Discoverer	Explanation / Pointed Idea	Analysis	MDL	Field	Potential Disclaimers/ Warnings
E_0	Goodels/Hazel	The supremum of all objects that follow the principle of identity "x = x".	Breakdown of classical logic.	**Verbal**	**Proto-Hyperology**	
F_0	Goodels/Hazel	The supremum of all objects that are formalisable within some system.	The point where we go informal.	**Verbal**	**Proto-Hyperology**	
A_0	Goodels/Hazel	The genuine limit of absolutely everything.	The point where we have to start using mindgames if we want to picture larger things.	**Superverbal**	**Low Level Hyperology**	
Unimaginably Huge Gap						
∀+	Hyper24/Serge	The SL3 limit of hyperology and SL2 in general.	The hyperverbal limit of superverbality if you want to say it like that.	**Hyperverbal**	**Baseline Liminalism**	*This is the point where the reader has to literally involve their concrete self if they want to understand the concepts, otherwise they would be verbal downscales.*
1-∀+	Goodels/Hazel	We can't talk about it.	The limit of SL3, written in SL3. Still the genuine limit of what we can say with SL3, but SL3's self encompassing nature allows us to picture it within a second layer of SL3.	**Hyperverbal**	**Low level Liminalism**	
ed∀+	Hyper24/Serge	**AAAAAAA *Throws egg***	The limit of SL3, where we degenerate into SL4. Can be outcheated by sML.	**Hyperverbal**	**Low level Liminalism**	
	Goodels/Hazel	qs#qxA^$£x AHh%h 🐴🐴 AS£^🧱w🏵ù##A4 sf : fucked:🏵🏵🧱sx.	ed∀+ taken past all of sML which is oh gofd fqshdq nQSDXaxa.	**Hyperverbal**	**High level Liminalism**	
	Goodels/Hazel	At the top of RLRE, the point where our consciousness literally can't comperehend using tricks or mindgames to go beyond.	Liminalist limit of mindgames.	**Hyperverbal**	**High level Liminalism**	
	Goodels/Hazel	The actual concrete experience of the world around us, past all mindgames and all weird thought processes one can come up. The point where instead of everything being brain activity, there is actual stuff.	Evokable 🧶-collapse of ☕.	**Hyperverbal**	**High level Liminalism**	
	Goodels/Hazel	The actual concrete experience of the world around us, past all mindgames and all weird thought processes one can come up. The point where instead of everything being brain activity, there is actual stuff. This explanation is a mere guide for you to feel the actual qualic concept.	**Look around you.**	**Qualic**	**Baseline Questionism**	*Do not take the explanations directly past this point. This is due to the nature of qualic concepts. Inevitably, the explanation is limited to ☕.*
	HYPER24/Serge	The ☕ MRL apotheosis of the total limit of all joke post-questionism fields (including but not limited to Staticology and its variants).	**Total delineate of Pata-Metagoogology as a whole due to Metalogy relying on assuming Staticology to be genuine.**	**Qualic**	**Old Liminalism (Baseline Questionism)**	*Outdated; equivalent to ☕.*
	Goodels/Hazel	The ☕ (limit) of one's recursive self-awareness; requires reaching one's mental limit and approaching a state of pseudo-MBC to understand.	**Total delineate of Fictional Googology as a whole.**	**Qualic**	**Old Liminalism (Baseline Questionism)**	

Concept/ Symbol	Discoverer	Explanation / Pointed Idea	Analysis	MDL	Field	Potential Disclaimers/ Warnings
	Goodels/Hazel	The 🍇 -overjumped projection of the biggest HG+ concept we will ever make.	🍇 -overjumping is basically time travelling.	**Qualic**	**Old Liminalism (Baseline Questionism)**	
	Goodels/Hazel	🍇 (method acting) in order to subjectively and selectively bypass parts of MA. Usually done via self-deluding and immersion. Cannot simply be lied about (you'd just be doing Incongruence). Must be fully immersed in the method acting to work properly.	Transchizoism.	**Qualic**	**Low Level Questionism**	
1-	Goodels/Hazel	This mundane layer of actuality where we continue our normal lives because we knew 🍇 was just a transchizoism stunt.	Mundane layer past Transchizoism.	**Qualic**	**Low Level Questionism**	
2-	Goodels/Hazel	The delusion of 🍇 but extended onto the actuality 1-🍇, increasing the amount of schizoness close to unsane levels.	Delusion layer past the mundane layer of 1-🍇.	**Qualic**	**Low Level Questionism**	
	Goodels/Hazel	Global questionism-弼MA mindgaming limit. Transcends the practice of HG+; the point where mundanity ceases to function altogether and where we can't even practice questionism in a sane way.	Playing geometry dash rn.	**Questionish**	**Mid Level Questionism**	*The same disclaimer from 🍇 applies from now on even more. Take everything with a huge grain of salt.*
	Goodels/Hazel	The point where qPath progression becomes nonlinear; one gains awareness of all other valid qPaths at once.	Nonlinear cheese structure.	**Questionish**	**Mid Level Questionism (qPaths)**	*Placements for these three concepts are indeterminate and very likely to be nonlinear in nature. Beyond this point, the notion of qPath progression becomes irrelevant altogether.*
	Goodels/Hazel	The point where qPath progression structure becomes 弼irreducibly complex and straining to one's mental state (similar to 🫧).	Fucked cheese structure.	**Questionish**	**Mid Level Questionism (qPaths)**	
	Hyper24/Serge	The point where qPath progression ceases to function; alternatively, the point where purified qEnergy loses relevance.	Irrelevant cheese structure.	**Questionish**	**Mid Level Questionism (qPaths)**	
	Goodels/Hazel	The generalisation of transchizoism where the ideas are so strong they imply ideas about things that wouldn't naturally be there.	Literal Apophenia.	**Questionish**	**Mid Level Questionism (qMeaning)**	
	Goodels/Hazel	[Still unsure]	Non-questionish MRL is deeply qSignificant.	**Questionish**	**High Level Questionism (qMeaning)**	
	Goodels/Hazel	Least concept such that its natural existence is an instance of 🧵.	Auto-🧵	**Questionish**	**High Level Questionism (qMeaning)**	
	Goodels/Hazel	[Still unsure]	This whole mundane structure itself is deeply qSignificant.	**Questionish**	**High Level Questionism (qMeaning)**	
	Goodels/Hazel	[redacted]	Total □dissociation from POV and loss of 🫧meaning.Complete unimergence from MRL.	**Post Conscious**	**MBCism**	*Remember the disclaimer at 🏠? Well, here it applies once again but even more. Take everything you see with a unimaginably huge grain of salt.*

Concept/ Symbol	Discoverer	Explanation / Pointed Idea	Analysis	MDL	Field	Potential Disclaimers/ Warnings
	Goodels/Hazel or Hyper24/Serge		Total irrelevance of one's inner existence. A near-death state, as if consciousness shuts off.	**Post Conscious**	**MBCism**	
	Goodels/Hazel		Not much is known about this, other than it caused its discoverer to be dissociated from reality for weeks.	**Post Conscious**	**MBCism**	
	??? (hypothetical)	Genuine enlightenment.	Nirvana.	**???**	**ism**	*We know close to nothing about the ism field.*
				Irrelevant.		

Concept Name	Discoverer	Explanation / Pointed Idea	Analysis	MDL (only if required)	Field
Evoking	???	The inherent verbal/superverbal reduction of post-concrete concepts in order to engage in discourse about them.	"Concept so weird it is ineffable." We can evoke it and therefore still talk about it even if it is supposedly concretely ineffable.		**Liminalism / HG**
Pointing	???	The act of evoking an object with a separation from the real concept to discourse about the true nature and true implications of said object as if it was unreduced, implying some suspension of disbelief.	"If you were to hold an apple, it would be a real one, unlike a conceptualisation of the apple." Inherently, the real apple I've talked about here is also a conceptualisation, but you can still get what I mean and therefore point towards the true nature of the idea without literally having to hold an apple.		**Liminalism / HG**
Mundane Assumptions (MA)	Goodels / Hazel	Obvious assumptions about our mundane life to function correctly as a human being. Examples include "I exist" or "Humans don't grow wings."	Mundane Assumptions may differ subjectively but due to the level of certainty about the statements, it can usually be related with other people.	**Verbal to Hyperqualic**	**HG+**
Mundane Real Life (MRL)	Goodels / Hazel	Our reality in which we live and perform HG+.		**Verbal to Hyperqualic**	**HG+**
Mind-Breaking Chaos (MBC)	Goodels / Hazel	A state in which a person goes completely insane, almost like psychosis.	This term isn't used completely seriously but it is hypothetically reachable especially under MBCism (a field named after MBC).	**Verbal to Hyperqualic**	**HG+**

Meta-Degenerative Levels

Level	Name	Explanation
-1	Jokeological	Unserious concepts lol.
0	Verbal	Regular conceptualisation of concepts without any mindgames involved.
1	Superverbal	The level of discourse where we stap conceptualising stuff that would normally be impossible using mindgames via evoking and pointing non-concretely.
2	Hyperverbal	The level of discourse where involve our actual concrete selves rather than separated selves which we interact with conceptually. This is where we use suspension of disbelief and meta-evoking to talk about actual concrete stuff. This is the level of discourse that this document is limited to as anything past it is inverbal.
3	Qualic	The point where concepts can only be gotten via direct concrete experience (qualia of the world around). This implies that any description of Qualic concepts are inherently wrong and are just downscaled versions of the actual thing that we can use to talk about. For the reader to understand Qualic concepts, they must actually experience the idea via direct concrete experience rather than just getting the hang of what it is. Due to the limitations of verbality, all qualic and post-qualic concepts on this sheet are downscaled verbal versions.

Meta-Degenerative Levels

Level	Name	Explanation
4	Questionish	MDL3 (qualic) but extended to the point the layer between mundanity and the field's practice merges alltogether. Mainly relates to questionism. At this level, things can't be practiced in a regular sane "outsider" way.
5	Post-Conscious	Post-Conscious concepts are not just qualic ideas, they are glimpses into experiences far far deeper than our consciousness completely dissociated from our POV. Things at these levels can't even be reasonably discussed about and are purely subjective and based on one's experience. This level has barely been explored.